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The career of the German historian Percy Ernst Schramm (1894–1970) was one of the most interesting and versatile in twentieth-century Germany. His importance lies not only in his innovative studies of medieval history, but also in his high-profile public role which was closely connected to his research interests. Arguably, these were not much more than two sides of the same coin. David Thimme’s intellectual biography *Percy Ernst Schramm und das Mittelalter* (2006), which is based on his 2003 doctoral thesis, examines Schramm first and foremost as a medievalist, but his roles as social historian, war diarist of the *Oberkommando der Wehrmacht* and contemporary historian of the Second World War still await more detailed analysis. While Thimme has discussed Schramm’s early career and works in great detail, there is only a relatively brief discussion of *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, Schramm’s most important post-war work, and related publications.¹ This article discusses Schramm as the historian of *Herrschaftszeichen*, which became perhaps his most enduring ‘brand’, and analyses his historiographical position and scholarly legacy in this respect, thus supplementing Thimme’s account of this theme. Within a broadly chronological framework, it also gives attention to Schramm’s personality, as well as his public and political role, adding some further insights to his networks by using additional sources not employed by Thimme in his book.

Thimme’s biography stems from his work in The Collaborative Research Centre Memory Cultures (*Sonderforschungsbereich, SFB 434, Erinnerungskulturen*) at the University of Gießen, which also produced Anne Christine Nagel’s *Im Schatten des Dritten Reichs: Mittelalterforschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1945–1970*.² The task of writing a biography in the form of a dissertation is not an easy one. In the case of a biography of a historian one has to find how to combine the discussion of the life and the subject’s


production. Thimme’s solution to discuss in each chronological part of the book first the outline of Schramm’s life and then in a total of four chapters entitled ‘Images from the Middle Ages’ (Bilder vom Mittelalter) his production, is somewhat repetitive and unfortunate.

The hitherto most significant historiographical discussion of Schramm after Thimme’s book is Eliza Garrison’s art-historical study on his portraiture theory. Garrison departs from the tradition of separating the production of Schramm the medievalist from that of Schramm the contemporary historian of the Second World War. Indeed, Garrison argues that ‘these two aspects of Schramm’s intellectual legacy were entirely of a piece’, and that ‘it is possible to speak of a willful grafting of his own political ideals onto the artworks and historical texts that were at the centre of his scholarship’. She compares, in particular, Denkmale der deutschen Könige und Kaiser (1962), Hitler als militärischer Führer (1962) and Schramm’s introduction to the second edition of Henry Picker’s Hitlers Tischgespräche (1963). The most striking examples presented by Garrison in support of her thesis are the ‘pointed and deliberate’ parallels between Schramm’s literary portrait of Hitler in the latter work and the Frankish courtier Einhard’s description of Charlemagne in the early ninth-century Vita Karoli Magni.

Before turning to discuss Herrschaftszeichen proper, the first half of this article outlines Schramm’s background, military service, formative years as a historian, and approach to the German political upheavals, which all contain elements that are instrumental for understanding his scholarly development and the central themes of his research. Continuities had a special place in Schramm’s work. Despite all the political changes to which he adapted, there appears to have been a certain attempt at conservative constancy also in his own life.

The Buddenbrooks of Hamburg

Percy Ernst Schramm was born in 1894 to a wealthy Hamburg merchant family, the fates and fortunes of which he described in his two-volume work Neun Generationen: Dreihundert Jahre deutscher “Kulturgeschichte” im Lichte der Schicksale einer Hamburger Bürgerfamilie (1648–1948). The parallel to the Buddenbrooks of Lübeck is obvious and Schramm himself referred to it, although beneath the surface he did not recognise similarities. The Schramms were perhaps even wealthier than the Buddenbrooks. In the beginning the housing conditions of Schramm’s parents – Max Schramm, who was elected to the Hamburg Senate in 1912, and his wife, Olga O’Swald – were ‘modest’, “only” eight rooms and “only” two maidservants, as their son commented with irony in
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4 Garrison 2009, 211.
the family chronicle. The name Percy came from the maternal grandfather, whose father Wilhelm Oswald had changed the spelling of his name to William O’Swald. This relates to the anglophile culture of the Hamburg bourgeoisie.

The family expected that Percy Ernst would choose either a commercial or a legal career, and attempted to curb his early interest in genealogy. Aby Warburg, a family friend, became an early mentor and ‘scholarly father’ to Schramm. The seventeen-year-old Schramm was planning to study knightly families that became burghers, underlining to his parents that if he became a historian, it was genealogy which would have led him to this theme. 

Schramm’s own family used a coat of arms but it was a question of the ‘[u]surpation of the arms of an Alsatian family’. 

The Hussar officer

On 3 August 1914, Schramm enlisted in the German Imperial Army hoping ‘naturally’ to get into the cavalry. He experienced the Great War in the 16th Hussar Regiment on the Eastern Front taking part, for instance, in the operations leading to the taking of Riga, and at the end of the war he was on the Western Front. He was wounded in 1915, commissioned as an officer and awarded the Iron Cross 1st Class. Belonging to the generation who went to the front became an important part of Schramm’s self-identity. He entitled his unpublished memoirs, written in the 1950s–1960s, half of which deals with the First World War, Jahrgang 94. However, he was not attracted to the quasi-mythological approach to war as represented by Ernst Jünger (1895–1998), which in Jünger’s case developed into radical nationalism.

In any case, Jünger offers an interesting point of comparison: both Jünger and Schramm later belonged to the cultural elite of the German Federal Republic, but unlike Schramm, Jünger never became a member of the National Socialist Party.

In 1917, Warburg wrote to Schramm, who had begun his university studies in 1914, that ‘[y]ou have to again gradually learn to view the world as a historian; leave the viewpoint of the monocled hussar to the casino’. Schramm had experienced military parades with Emperor Wilhelm II, but according to Thimme’s account, it appears to have been fairly easy for the future historian of the medieval German Empire to accept the change of the form of government from the Wilhelmine monarchy to a republic. Schramm, of course, opposed Bolshevism as a member of the Freikorps, but Thimme asserts he did not wish
the monarchy back since he regarded the republic as the best possible form of government.\textsuperscript{12}

Schramm remained proud of his cavalry officer background throughout his life. Between 1934 and 1938 he was a member of SA-Reitersturm, and was promoted in the reserve to First Lieutenant in 1937 and Cavalry Captain (Rittmeister) in 1939, a rank he was sorry to part with on his promotion to Major in 1943. Schramm regarded military service as his duty and served in the Second World War first as a staff officer during the Polish and the French campaigns — experiencing the capitulation of Lille — and then briefly in the propaganda department of the Wehrmacht, being sent, for instance, to Hungary and Crimea.\textsuperscript{13} During the later denazification proceedings, Schramm displayed selective memory by insisting that he was transferred to Wehrmachtsführungsstab in 1943 ‘as being an expert who could not do propaganda work’.\textsuperscript{14} Yet the texts from his propaganda period are quite typical examples of their genre. For instance, Schramm described that he saw in a prisoner-of-war camp in Ukraine

\begin{quote}
a mass of several hundred ‘Russians’, that is a zoo of all sorts of horrible so-called ‘homo sapiens’: Bashkirs, Uzbeks, Siberians, Mongolians and who knows what semi-barbarous tribes there are in the vast Soviet empire.\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

Schramm’s texts concentrated mostly on the ‘Eastern question’ and he criticised ‘Jewish Bolshevism’. For Schramm the war was essentially a battle between Europe and Asia.\textsuperscript{16}

Since March 1943, Schramm served as keeper of the war diary of the Oberkommando der Wehrmacht in the Wehrmachtsführungsstab, thinking of himself as a ‘notary of the downfall’ (Notar des Untergangs). In that capacity he was the superior of a small three-person office, where one of his subordinates was First Lieutenant Walther Hubatsch (1915–1984), who later became Professor of History in Göttingen and Bonn. While Schramm did not serve in close proximity to Hitler, with whom he ‘never spoke a word’,\textsuperscript{17} for a historian this position gave a unique perspective on the leadership of the German armed forces. Furthermore, he received ‘the aura of the immediate witness’ as a Göttingen history student

\textsuperscript{12} Thimme 2006, 74, 79, 156. For the Schramm family attitude to Emperor Wilhelm II, see also Schramm 1963–1964, 2–479.


\textsuperscript{14} New York, Leo Baeck Institute, Ernst Kantorowicz Collection; AR 7216 / MF 561; II/7/3. P. E. Schramm to ‘Your Magnificence’, 27 December 1947. Available online at (accessed 2 December 2011) http://www.archive.org/stream/ernstkantorowicz00reel05#page/n700/mode/1up.


\textsuperscript{16} Messerschmidt 2004, 437, 439.

Dietrich Geyer, who later became a professor, put it.\(^{18}\) Later, Schramm himself could note with pleasure that his ‘war diary was treated in the Historical Division of the Pentagon like the New Testament in Church’.\(^{19}\)

At the Nuremberg Trials Schramm was a witness in the legal sense and gave testimony on behalf of his former superior Colonel General Alfred Jodl, who was eventually hanged, but posthumously cleared of the main war crime charges by a German court. Schramm’s eye for outward signs and his ability to read them became evident in this context as well. When the defence counsel asked if Jodl ‘was fond of the limelight and had great ambitions’, Schramm answered ‘with a definite “No”’ continuing: ‘I always thought it peculiar and even grotesque, that the General, at the time of Adolf Hitler’s death, had scarcely more German war decorations than I had myself, a mere major in the reserve. I did not see whether he had foreign decorations. I never saw him wearing a foreign order.’\(^{20}\) Jodl’s grateful widow, who had married the general in March 1945, painted a sympathetic picture of Schramm in her book, telling that it meant a lot to her ‘to learn so much about Alfred from this unusually humanely thinking historian’\(^{21}\).

The making of a historian and a meeting with the last emperor

The intellectual circle which was formed around Warburg’s library played a crucial part in shaping Schramm’s early research agenda. Ernst Cassirer and his *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* (1923–1929) were central to the Warburg Library Circle, but although Schramm was later planning to study the ‘history of symbolic thought’ (*Geschichte des symbolischen Denkens*), Cassirer’s highly abstract concepts did not affect him greatly. A more important point of contact was Erwin Panofsky.\(^{22}\) The central theme of the Warburg Library, the afterlife of antiquity (*Nachleben der Antike*), was to recur in Schramm’s production.\(^{23}\)

Given the German intellectual atmosphere of the time, it is hardly surprising that the concept of the state played a central role both in Schramm’s intellectual development and in his production.\(^{24}\) Right in the beginning of his academic studies, he dedicated himself to the question of the essence of the state


\(^{19}\) Percy Ernst Schramm, *Der zweite Welkrieg als wissenschaftliches Problem* (Collected Papers of the Guest Lecturers in the Department of History, University of Oulu, Finland, 5), Oulu 1970, 12: ‘Kriegstagebuch in der “Historical Division” des Pentagon behandelt wird wie in der Kirche das Neue Testament’.

\(^{20}\) The Trial of German Major War Criminals: Proceedings of the International Military Tribunal Sitting at Nuremberg, Germany, Part 16, H. M. Stationery Office: London 1948, 57. This was a reference to the fact that Jodl had received the clasps to his Iron Crosses in 1939, but did not receive the Knight’s Cross of the Iron Cross (and the Oak Leaves) until May 1945, when they were conferred on him by Karl Dönitz.


\(^{22}\) Timme 2006, 99–100, 443, 453. See also Burkart 2009, 88, 90.

\(^{23}\) Timme 2006, 102–107, 229.

(das Wesen des Staates), a concept which is later found in the subtitle of his book Der König von Frankreich: Das Wesen der Monarchie vom 9. zum 16. Jahrhundert (1939). The surrounding political complexities undoubtedly played their role as well: during his life Schramm was a citizen of four different states.

On the one hand, young Schramm regarded Ranke as an exemplary historian and, indeed, in Wolfgang Weber’s study of the German ordinary professors of history, which includes their rather formalistic division into the heirs of Ranke, Droysen and Mommsen; Schramm is classified among ‘Ranke’s successors from other school contexts’. On the other hand, Schramm perceived the German imperial Middle Ages in a neo-romantic aesthetic-poetical fashion as an ideal epoch, ‘the period of national unity and great emperors’. Schramm defined himself as Augenmensch and visual material consequently played a great role in his production; ironically, the only image in his biography is his photograph on the front cover. In an era before interdisciplinarity became commonplace, Schramm combined the art historical with the historical approach. The collapse of the empires and the following battle of political symbols inspired, more or less directly, scholarly contributions on royal and state emblems between the world wars, not only in Germany but elsewhere too. Schramm’s special interest in monarchical insignia was evident beginning right from his work leading to his 1922 doctoral thesis on Emperor Otto III. His first published book was Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit (1928); a revised posthumous second edition was published in 1983, but Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio (1929), is still regarded by some as his most important work. With these credentials, Schramm was appointed Professor of Medieval and Modern History and Auxiliary Sciences of History at the University of Göttingen (Georg-August-Universität) in 1929, a position he held until his retirement in 1963.

Unlike Thimme, the biographer of Schramm’s Doktorvater, Professor Karl Hampe has directed attention to Hampe’s and Schramm’s visits to the exiled Emperor Wilhelm II. According to Schramm’s own description, published in 1964, his visit was inspired by the fact that the Emperor had been reading books
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by Schramm’s Göttingen professor colleague Karl Brandi. Schramm, in turn, wanted to present Wilhelm II with his book on the imagery of ‘our medieval kings and emperors’. Schramm conducted the visit together with his wife Ehrengard v. Thadden, who was of Pomeranian Junker stock, and had been ‘raised in a markedly Prussian- and monarchist-minded environment’, but was transformed into a Social Democratic politician during the post-war period. The way for the visit was paved by Schramm’s father-in-law, a Knight of the Johanniterorden, who had been advising the Emperor on trees at his Huis Doorn estate.

Schramm’s first impression of Wilhelm II, who was wearing a miniature of the Pour le Mérite in a button-hole, was of ‘a grand seigneur’ (ein Grandseigneur). The Emperor was interested in the question when the eagle had become the imperial emblem and the discussion with Schramm led to the double-headed eagle, the Brandenburg eagle and further to the development of Prussian military colours. – Some three decades later Schramm’s student Johannes Enno (Hans-Enno) Korn (1934–1985) completed his doctoral thesis on Adler und Doppeladler: ein Zeichen im Wandel der Geschichte (1962). – When taking their leave, the visitors were given the Emperor’s signed photograph and his memoirs. In a letter to her brother, Schramm’s wife reported that they encountered a ‘ridiculous fawning courtier’ (ein lächerlicher Hofschranz) in the Emperor’s household, but summed up that, on the whole, the visit meant a lot for them.

**Schramm, Kantorowicz and the Third Reich**

The fact that Schramm and Ernst H. Kantorowicz ‘had a lot in common’ has meant that a number of comparisons have been drawn between them, most infamously by Norman F. Cantor (1929–2004), who labelled them ‘The Nazi Twins’ in an essay of his. But despite its error-ridden nature, the essay offers
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30 Folker Reichert, Gelehrtes Leben: Karl Hampe, das Mittelalter und die Geschichte der Deutschen, Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen 2009, 157. Reichert’s work includes (at 223–225, 238–239) a brief biographical discussion of Schramm, but given the perspective, it understandably does not add much to the picture of Schramm.


some useful characterisations: ‘Both had a proclivity to synthetic history, big subjects treated in the grand manner and written in a neo-Victorian mode with verve and eloquence.’\textsuperscript{34} Cantor regarded Schramm’s \textit{Herrschaftszeichen und Staatsymbolik} and Kantorowicz’s \textit{The King’s Two Bodies} ‘as the end of an era in the humanistic tradition of Central Europe, the last products of the culture of German idealism in medieval studies’\textsuperscript{35}. In contrast to Cantor, the details are Thimme’s strength, but one misses Cantor’s bold comparative statements. With regard to their early works, Schramm and Kantorowicz had most in common in their methodological approach, as Thimme points out.\textsuperscript{36} Joseph Mali, too, comments in his \textit{Mythistory} that the ‘ideological and methodological affinities between’ Schramm’s \textit{Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio} ‘and Kantorowicz’s biography of Frederick are evident’.\textsuperscript{37}

The literature on Kantorowicz is more voluminous, but as yet he lacks a coherent discussion in the fashion of Thimme’s monograph format. The similarities of the lives of Schramm and Kantorowicz begin with their affluent backgrounds and their service as volunteers in the First World War and in the \textit{Freikorps}. While Kantorowicz saw service on various fronts – twice on the Western Front, being wounded in Verdun in 1916, as well as in Ukraine and Turkey – his military service record has sometimes been overstated.\textsuperscript{38} Whereas Warburg had been the ‘scholarly father’ to Schramm, the poet Stefan George was a great early inspiration to Kantorowicz. Schramm and Kantorowicz knew each other from the early 1920s, but Schramm did not belong to the George Circle although he knew some of its members. In 1938, after having been practically forced to leave Germany as a Jew and when seeking an academic position in the United States, Kantorowicz received a recommendation letter from Schramm, in which he interestingly underlined the importance of this poetic inspiration.\textsuperscript{39}
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For his richer development his acquaintance with Stefan George became decisive. The latter opened his eyes to great personalities and stimulated him to think through the great problems of history in original ways.

While Schramm’s and Kantorowicz’s friendship lasted — there was the occasional meeting in Princeton and Rome — it was not as close after the latter’s emigration to the United States. In Laudes Regiae (1946), the manuscript of which Kantorowicz had delivered to the press in 1941, he acknowledged Schramm’s generous co-operation. Yet Kantorowicz’s American production remained somewhat distant to Schramm despite the fact that he followed it, along with that of Kantorowicz’s students, for instance, Ralph E. Giesey’s The Royal Funeral Ceremony in Renaissance France (1960). In 1955, Schramm dedicated his Kaiser Friedrichs II. Herrschaftszeichen to Kantorowicz, whose early fame had been made by Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite (1927), ‘in memory of the happy years spent together in Heidelberg’ (zur Erinnerung an die glücklichen, gemeinsam verlebten Jahre in Heidelberg).

Despite the manifest differences in their activities during the Second World War era one interesting point of comparison can be singled out: both came to serve the U. S. Army, one voluntarily, the other under compulsion. During the winter semester 1943–1944, Kantorowicz lectured for the Army Special Training Program on German history at Berkeley. After having been taken a prisoner of war in 1945, Schramm was stationed at the U. S. Army Historical Section in Paris with the duty to analyse German strategy and tactics.

According to Schramm’s own account, written in the late 1960s, he replied to the Archbishop of Canterbury’s question whether he was a Nazi in May 1937 that...

Kantorowicz. Available online at (accessed 2 December 2011) http://www.archive.org/stream/ernstkanotorowicz00rees0mq1/page/n127/mode/1up. Kantorowicz was not the only Jewish scholar on his way to exile who Schramm provided with references. (Sir) Nikolaus Pevsner (1902–1983) received ‘glowing references from Wilhelm Pinder, Tancred Borenius, and Ernst Schramm, the Göttingen history professor with whom he had been working on art and sociology in the Middle Ages’ (Susie Harries, Nikolaus Pevsner: The Life, Chatto & Windus: London 2011, 127). Proposing Schramm for honorary foreign membership of the American Historical Association in 1969, his long-time friend Gray C. Boyce wrote that ‘in 1933/35 he was active in trying to get unfortunate Jewish scholars placed outside of Germany and was not looked upon with favor by a number of the confessed Nazis’. Philipp Stetzel, ‘Working Toward a Common Goal?: American Views on German Historiography and German–American Scholarly Relations during the 1960s’, Central European History 41 (2008), 639–671, at 647 n. 41.


44. Thimme 2006, 488.

[w]ith respect to rearmament [...] a two-hundred percent Nazi; to “labor peace” [...] a one hundred percent Nazi; to racial theory, the cult of Germanic peoples, educational policy, Nazi world-view – a one hundred percent opponent. Every night ... I have to ask myself to what extent I agree with the party’s goals and to what extent I reject them. The answer is different every night. This is not only my fate, but that of the German intelligentsia as such.

Later in the same year, Schramm applied for the membership of the National Socialist Party, but his application was at first rejected. Already earlier, the party officials had observed that as a 'representative of late liberalism (Spätliberalismus)' he was not politically trustworthy. He finally became a member of the party in February 1939. In the late 1920s, Schramm had briefly been a member of the national liberal Deutsche Volkspartei, but his most active political participation seems to have been in 1932 when he published election propaganda for Hindenburg’s presidential campaign.

In 1938, Schramm welcomed the Anschluß of Austria as the boldest and most felicitous foreign policy feat of our new government [...] Eighty million – without the shedding of blood. Neither Bismarck nor the Maid of Orleans could accomplish that, only somebody who combined the abilities of both.

Schramm’s former student Joist Grolle, who first published these two quotations, has maintained that Schramm was ‘never National Socialist in the full sense of the word’. Schramm’s party membership seems to have been motivated at least partly by aspirations to be thereby able to gain a more influential role in university politics. Yet Schramm remained so proud of his ‘origin and birth’ that he was ‘never drawn to national socialism’ (niemals zum Nationalsozialismus finden), as Hans Drexler, Rector of the University of Göttingen and leader of the local National Socialist Dozentenbund, complained in September 1944. Some days after Drexler had written his report, Schramm’s sister-in-law Elisabeth von Thadden, who had been arrested in January 1944 and kept in Ravensbrück concentration camp, was executed. In July 1944, the fellow historian Gerhard Ritter had wondered if ‘Percy Schramm is still the naïve enthusiast as I knew him earlier’.

Describing the ‘University situation in Germany’ in August 1945, Erwin Panofsky made a division into those who have ‘a real, honest-to-Goodness hatred
of Nazism’ and, on the other hand, the ‘black sheep’ among whom Heidegger, for instance, belonged to the ‘most dangerous […] not such well-known pests’. In Panofsky’s classification Schramm fell into the category of ‘half-hearted Nazis’: he “did not agree” with Hitler on all points but made the best of it and now look [sic] forward to an “inner renascence” [sic] of Germany’.51 During the denazification proceedings Schramm maintained that he had done nothing wrong, just his duty. Kantorowicz was ready to help a friend in need by affirming that ‘Schramm was not a pupil of Nazism or Nazi indoctrination’ and that, to his knowledge, Schramm had ‘never […] demonstrated a nationalistic or militaristic attitude’,52 just the phrase the denazification boards were after. Schramm was reinstated to his professorship in 1948. While Kantorowicz’s solidarity with Schramm seems to be a wonder to some modern scholars,53 there has been a tendency until recently to treat Schramm’s medievalist scholarship separately from his political and military associations and his writings on contemporary history. For instance, Karl Leyser (1920–1992), who left Germany as a Jewish refugee in 1937 and was a Captain in the British Army at the end of the Second World War, regarded Schramm in 1975 simply as ‘a giant amongst German historians’.54

‘Under the swastika’ and in Westminster Abbey

Whether Schramm was a great opportunist or just a conformist can be debated, but it is evident that while his historical works published between 1933 and 1945 were not propaganda, neither did he seek to completely detach his scholarship from the politics of the day. The portrait of his relationship to the National Socialist regime cannot properly be painted in black and white; many shades of grey are needed as well.55 It is clear that Schramm’s research themes were topical. ‘Both imperial and royal traditions in the Middle Ages played an important part for the nationalist-socialist view of history’, as Hans-Ulrich Thamer has put it.56

In 1937 Schramm was planning a documentary film on the monuments

52 Thimme 2006, 489–492; New York, Leo Baeck Institute, Ernst Kantorowicz Collection; AR 7216 / MF 561, II/7/3; Ernst H. Kantorowicz to whom it may concern, May 27th 1947. Available online (accessed 2 December 2011) at http://www.archive.org/stream/ernstkantorowicz00reel05#page/n724/mode/1up.
53 Ruehl 2000, 226 n. 207: ‘In view of Schramm’s involvement with the Nazi state, it seems remarkable that Kantorowicz, whose mother and cousin died in Theresienstadt, resumed friendly relations with him soon after World War II and helped his reinstatement at Göttingen with an unreservedly eulogistic four-page affidavit in 1947, despite misgivings about Schramm’s party membership’. The comparison is repeated in Martin A. Ruehl, ‘“Imperium transcendat hominem”: Reich and Rulership in Ernst Kantorowicz’s Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite’, in Melissa S. Lane and Martin A. Ruehl eds., A Poet’s Reich: Politics and Culture in the George Circle, Camden House: Rochester, NY 2011, 204–247, at 219–220.
55 As Joist Grolle (1989, 35) has put it: ‘Wer näher hinsieht, stößt auf einen Mann, der in die Klischees nachträglicher Schwarzweißmalerei nicht paßt’.
(Denkmäler) of the medieval emperors, which was, alas, never completed.\textsuperscript{57} The following year, the imperial regalia were brought from Vienna to Nuremberg.

\textit{A History of the English Coronation}, produced both in German and English to coincide with the coronation of King George VI in 1937, includes a reference to contemporary 'state feasts' (\textit{Staatsfeste}) in the renewed states of Italy and Germany as ‘festivals under the \textit{Fasces}' and ‘assemblies under the swastika in Berlin, Munich, and Nuremberg', which Thimme calls ‘monstrous propaganda spectacles’.\textsuperscript{58} Schramm participated in the 1937 coronation formally as a press representative of \textit{Kreuz-Zeitung} 'in white tie and decorations [i.e. wearing his Iron Crosses] and two apples in pocket', as another German newspaper put it. Prior to the coronation Schramm had drafted a letter to Hitler proposing that he should donate a replica of Richard of Cornwall’s sceptre with a dove (1257) to George VI, but it is unclear whether Schramm sent his letter.\textsuperscript{59}

As Alice Hunt has put it,\textsuperscript{60}

‘[u]ntil Roy Strong’s 2005 majesterial survey of the English coronation, \textit{Coronation}, the only comprehensive overview available was Percy Ernst Schramm’s 1937 \textit{A History of the English Coronation}, which is marked by conservatism and nostalgia.

Hunt has commented on Schramm’s conservative emphasis on continuity by quoting as an example that Schramm saw ‘no gap between the Middle Ages and our time’ with regard to the English coronation.\textsuperscript{61} In Ronald Lightbown’s estimation Schramm’s work was the ‘first attempt at a serious historical synthesis of’ the English coronation \textit{ordines}, but\textsuperscript{62}

Schramm was too hasty in drawing conclusions, and wrote much more as a historian of kingship and constitutional matters than as a historian of ritual and ceremony in dealing with the English coronation.

\textbf{Epochs of the honours}

Schramm could stress thematic long-term continuities too: his history of the orb, \textit{Sphaira}, \textit{Globus}, \textit{Reichsapfel} (1958) stretches from Caesar to Elizabeth II. While

\textsuperscript{57} Thimme 2006, 582–583.


Schramm the social and military historian was at home in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, there is nevertheless an interesting tendency in him to give value judgements which seem to prefer the early and high Middle Ages over late medieval phenomena. According to Schramm, the monarchical orders of knighthood, instituted since the early fourteenth century, following the fashion of the day and the whim of princes, enabled men a little longer to play at chivalry, which by now had outlived its purpose. [...] Chivalry was in reality dead and these ‘knights’ were in fact calculating statesmen, adroit courtiers, and scions of eminent houses, whose descent secured their admission to the order.

In the post-medieval process, where the orders of knighthood were transformed into ‘mere decorations’ arranged in pyramid-form hierarchies, Schramm saw little else than degradation.

Schramm’s work on his family history includes some further reflections on the lack of prestige of modern orders and medals, such as the fact that the commemorative medal of the 100th birthday of Emperor Wilhelm ‘the Great’ was commonly called an ‘orange’ (Apfelsine) owing to its large size and colour and that the insignia of the orders his maternal grandfather William O’Swald had received from the Sultan of Zanzibar ‘were not taken seriously by connoisseurs’. Some of the Hamburg patriots were less happy with the proliferation of Prussian orders at the time of German unification and when Dr Eduard Schramm received a Prussian order, the comment from his wife – born von der Meden – was: ‘Surely you are not going to put on that dog tag!’ (Diese Hundemarke wirst Du Dir doch nicht anhängen!). When Schramm’s uncle Alfred (Freddy) O’Swald wore an oversized breast star of the Order of the Brilliant Star of Zanzibar, Emperor Wilhelm II observed it with an ‘eagle glance’, but did not recognise it ‘despite the broadest expertise in the field of orders and decorations’. Having received a reply, the Emperor said bluntly that such a thing ought not to be worn (Aber, Mensch, so was trägt man doch nicht!), but the final line went to O’Swald: Faute de mieux! Your Majesty.

The latter half of this article turns to examine Schramm’s Herrschaftszeichen oeuvre and both its contemporary reception as well as later legacy. Before more general concluding remarks, Schramm’s own administrative
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role in the West German honours system and its relationship to his scholarship is discussed.

**Herrschaftszeichen: setting the terms**

Schramm’s connections with *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* began with a three-year editorial post in the 1920s and it was in its *Schriften* series (13/I–III) that his *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik: Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte vom dritten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert* was published between 1954 and 1956. As Nikolaus Gussone put it, ‘the weightiest part of Schramm’s life work can be summarised under this pair of concepts’, to the extent that it became his trademark (*Markenzeichen*). Kaiser Friedrichs II. *Herrschaftszeichen* (1955) is in practice the fourth volume of the series and yet another volume was dedicated to the orb, *Sphaira, Globus, Reichsapfel: Wanderung und Wandlung eines Herrschaftszeichens von Caesar bis zu Elisabeth II: Ein Beitrag zum “Nachleben” der Antike* (1958), while the article ‘Herrschaftszeichen: gestiftet, verschenkt, verkauft, verpfändet: Belege aus dem Mittelalter’ dealt with insignia the rulers parted with for some reason or other. Schramm’s plan was to dedicate one volume of his collected works, *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste*, to his further writings about *Herrschaftszeichen* and *Staatssymbolik*, but this did not materialise. However, it is a testimony to Schramm’s scholarly gusto that a sixty-page long *Nachträge aus dem Nachlaß* to *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* could be published in 1978. Research was for Schramm an unending process of collecting and adding new information as well as revising what had previously been published.

Schramm’s interest in this topic had become more articulated in the latter half of the 1930s. He published a short article on the papal tiara in 1935, where he referred to Gerhart Ladner’s (1905–1993) work on papal iconography; Ladner returned to the origins and medieval development of the papal tiara in an extensive article published in 1980. But it was Schramm’s introduction, ‘Die
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66 Gussone 1994, 93. Gussone was one of the editors of the 1983 revised posthumous second edition of *Die deutschen Kaiser und Könige in Bildern ihrer Zeit* (Prestel).
Erforschung der mittelalterliche “Symbole”: Wege und Methoden’, to his student Berent Schwineköper’s doctoral thesis Der Handschuh im Recht, Ämterwesen, Brauch und Volksbrauch (1938), that Schramm set out his new methodological and theoretical principles. As opposed to the methods of the Warburg circle, here Schramm connected himself to the tradition of legal history, represented first and foremost by Karl von Amira and Jacob Grimm. While the article was about the research of medieval symbols as stated in its title, Schramm voiced his opposition to the use of the very word ‘symbol’, which he considered to be too vague. Instead, he preferred Sinnzeichen, which was hardly any more precise, setting out a conceptual family of different Zeichen (signs) in combination with different prefixes: Amts-, Standes-, Rang-, and above all, Herrschaftszeichen. Sinnzeichen in the strict sense could be called Rechtszeichen (legal signs), since they expressed legal relationships. With a cautionary reference to Sir James Frazer Schramm underlined the importance of paying attention to contextual differences in regard to time and place.72 Schramm also formulated what was to become a central theme in his research agenda: a study of the methods which were used during the Middle Ages in order ‘to make the invisible visible and to form the visible and understandable in such a way that a deeper meaning could be placed on it’.73 Later Schramm divided different signs under two groups, Sinnzeichen and Abzeichen.74

Schramm put his theory into practice in Der König von Frankreich (1939), which includes a section on Herrschaftssymbolik,75 but when the book appeared in print, he was already a staff officer on the Eastern Front. He returned to Herrschaftszeichen in 1950 when he spoke of ‘Über die Herrschaftszeichen des Mittelalters’ in conjunction with the Ars Sacra exhibition in Munich.76 Another of Schramm’s key concepts, Staatssymbolik, made its first appearance here.77 The article ‘Wie sahen die mittelalterlichen Herrschaftszeichen aus? Über die Methoden zur Beantwortung dieser Frage’, published in Archiv für Kulturgeschichte in 1953, became the introduction to Herrschaftszeichen und


Staatssymbolik. The term Herrschaftszeichen appears in seventeenth and eighteenth century literature and poetry (usually spelled Herrschaft Zeichen), but its modern usage has been heavily shaped by Schramm’s work. As Jürgen Petersohn has put it, it is a modern term, especially favoured by [...] Schramm [...] and imbued by him with a specific meaning. The medieval Latin sources refer to insignia (insignia imperialia, regalia insignia).

The term regalia has been frequently used in English alongside of the more popular expression crown jewels.

The latest German research has to some extent returned to the use of Insignien, which Schramm considered to be a ‘worn-out foreign word’ (abgegriffene Fremdwort). The primary group of Herrschaftszeichen is formed by crowns, sceptres, orbs, swords, staffs, rings, armills and others ‘actually worn or carried by a ruler as visible signs of his invisible office’, as János M. Bak has put it. In English ‘the visible emblems of royalty which pertain to a monarch’ have often been termed ‘Crown Jewels or Regalia’ as the Encyclopaedia Britannica entry, which was partly revised by Schramm, has it. However, Schramm’s Herrschaftszeichen cover a wider range of phenomena – such as thrones, relics, coats of arms, banners and gestures – which made visible the invisible fact that someone was ‘an emperor, a king, a duke, a prince or a count’.

Indeed, Schramm’s understanding of Herrschaftszeichen was predominantly monarchical-nobiliary and he was criticised for that. Partly unfairly, one could say, since Schramm did not forget, for instance, ecclesiastical insignia or those of the doge of Venice, who ‘was originally really a dux’. Furthermore, even current
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84 Schramm 1968–1971, 1.22.

85 One of the most critical reviewers of Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik was the legal historian Karl S. Bader (1905–1998) in Historische Zeitschrift 185 (1958), 114–125.

social theory regards Herrschaft as a basic category which by definition implies ‘asymmetrical social interrelation’. For cases when it is not clear whether a sign pertains to a ruler, Schramm suggested the use of the term Würdezeichen (sign of dignity) following the model of Karl Hauck (1916–2007), one of the contributors to Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik. Ladner’s wide definition of insignia included ‘political or ecclesiastical signs of rulership or office [...] and [...] other signs designating various orders, ranks, and dignities’. Schramm’s terminology is slightly problematic in an increasingly Anglophone scholarly world since neither Herrschaftszeichen nor Staatssymbolik translates well into English. Schramm’s former student Bak translated them as ‘Ruler’s Insignia and State Symbology’, but Herrschaftszeichen has also been variously translated as ‘signs of rulership’, ‘signs of lordship’, ‘signs of dominion’, ‘signs of power’ or using the words ‘symbol’ and ‘insignia’ abandoned by Schramm: ‘symbols of sovereignty’, ‘symbol[s] of rule and authority’, ‘symbols of royalty’, ‘symbols of rulership’, ‘insignia of sovereignty’ and ‘insignia of rulership’.

In search of the state

As the motto of Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik Schramm quoted Goethe’s thoughts on symbolism: ‘The symbol is that which it symbolises without being that object; it is an image withdrawn into the mirror of spirit yet identical to its object.’ Schramm had read his Goethe and, as Philippe Buc has pointed out, he may have been influenced by Goethe’s literary models in his other formulations as well. As an example, Buc quotes the description of the integration of people – ‘united into a noble body, defined as a unit, assembled and fastened in
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a single mass, a single form animated by a single spirit’ — from Goethe’s Italian travel diary from 1786, and compares it to Schramm’s position on the ‘essence of a State’ in *A History of the English Coronation* (1937): it ‘is something more that its constitution, its system of laws, and its theory’, it ‘must demonstrate [...] its life’ and ‘have a body [...] that everyone can assimilate into himself [...] with his senses’. According to Buc’s interpretation,100

The chaotic world of mass democratic politics, in which one could not count on the mob to understand the State rationally, and therefore constitute a nation and a people, motivated Schramm to think of the medieval state before there was really a state as an absent presence.

Other scholars, too, have commented on Schramm’s ‘Hegelian search for an abstract concept of the state’, which ‘has barely survived post-modernist critiques’, where the focus has shifted ‘from abstract ideas and institutions to relations between human agents and specific historical phenomena’, as Ildar H. Garipzanov has put it.101 ‘To talk of *Staatssymbolik* with Percy Ernst Schramm is precisely to imply that there is a state somewhere with a separate real existence which can be symbolised’, as Timothy Reuter has pointed out.102

**Wissenschaft der Herrschaftszeichen?**

In the 1953 congress of German historians Schramm announced his intention of creating *Wissenschaft der Herrschaftszeichen*. He preferred this expression ‘instead of a foreign word’,103 but Klaus Wessel argued in a review of *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* in 1958 that the newly-formed discipline should be called insigniology (*Insigniologie*) despite Schramm’s antipathy towards the stem word *Insignium*.104 Eckart Henning has used almost the same term, insigniology (*Insigniologie*), placing it under ‘legal archeology’ (*Rechtsarchäologie*),105 and referred to Schramm as a ‘great insigniologist’.106 According to Martina Hartmann, Schramm established the research in
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Insignienkunde (insignienkundliche Forschung). Schramm’s former student Hans Martin Schaller (1923–2005) was more faithful to Schramm’s terminology designating him the ‘founder of a new auxiliary science of history, “Herrschaftszeichen und Staatsymbolik”’ in Neue Deutsche Biographie. Sometimes the term Herrschaftszeichenforschung has been employed.

One finds in German method books and historiographical discussions expressions such as Das Insignienkunde als Wissenschaft von den Herrschaftszeichen and Schramm’s name is sometimes associated with the above-mentioned Insignienkunde. Already in 1976, the art historian Wayne Dynes pointed out that the study of regalia and attributes of state in general, is flourishing. This area of research owes its existence almost entirely to the efforts of Percy Ernst Schramm and his pupils.

However, opinions on whether Schramm actually did establish a new auxiliary science differ. Although ‘a lot of resonance’ was generated, there was ‘no effective reception’ and ‘only little critical discussion’, as Ludger Körntgen has put it, describing ‘Schramm’s large-scale project more as a universally admired erratic block in the research landscape’. According to Körntgen Wissenschaft der Herrschaftszeichen was not really taken up as an independent discipline. Giorgio Agamben has likewise argued that ‘The science of the signs of power still awaits its foundation.’

‘Le grand P. E. Schramm’ – ‘ce Linné allemand des signes de souveraineté’

These characterisations by the French medievalists Michel Pastoureau and Alain Boureau from 2004 and 1990 respectively witness to Schramm’s continuing relevance in France. Earlier French superlatives had been voiced, for instance, by
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108 One finds in German method books and historiographical discussions expressions such as Das Insignienkunde als Wissenschaft von den Herrschaftszeichen and Schramm’s name is sometimes associated with the above-mentioned Insignienkunde. Already in 1976, the art historian Wayne Dynes pointed out that the study of regalia and attributes of state in general, is flourishing. This area of research owes its existence almost entirely to the efforts of Percy Ernst Schramm and his pupils.

109 However, opinions on whether Schramm actually did establish a new auxiliary science differ. Although ‘a lot of resonance’ was generated, there was ‘no effective reception’ and ‘only little critical discussion’, as Ludger Körntgen has put it, describing ‘Schramm’s large-scale project more as a universally admired erratic block in the research landscape’. According to Körntgen Wissenschaft der Herrschaftszeichen was not really taken up as an independent discipline. Giorgio Agamben has likewise argued that ‘The science of the signs of power still awaits its foundation.’

110 ‘Le grand P. E. Schramm’ – ‘ce Linné allemand des signes de souveraineté’

These characterisations by the French medievalists Michel Pastoureau and Alain Boureau from 2004 and 1990 respectively witness to Schramm’s continuing relevance in France. Earlier French superlatives had been voiced, for instance, by
Georges Tessier, who found *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* to be ‘a wonderful monument of erudition’. In his 1972 article about the so-called crown of Charlemagne the nobleman-scholar of the French monarchy Baron Hervé Pinoteau (b. 1927) saluted the memory of Schramm, ‘master of insigniology’, who had written that he follows with interest the progress of Pinoteau’s work. Later Pinoteau has called Schramm a ‘giant of scholarship’. Pierre Nora was instrumental in Kantorowicz’s resurgence in France by commissioning a French translation of *The King’s Two Bodies* (1989), but both the concept of Nora’s own great collaborative effort, *Les Lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992), and the centrality of the notion of the state in it, seem to owe something to Schramm’s *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, although the more general approach and light French essay-like prose cannot really be compared to Schramm’s heavily-annotated Teutonic erudition. Nora’s phrase, *ce Linné allemande de la symbolique du pouvoir*, echoes that of Bourreau. In early volumes of his journal, *Le Débat*, Nora published Philippe Braunstein’s *livre-montage* of *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, a commented summary translation. Owing to Schramm’s *longue durée* approach, Jacques Le Goff in 1995 compared him to Marc Bloch and Fernand Braudel.

Thimme has discussed the reception of Schramm’s works in Germany in detail, but has paid less attention to his foreign reception, although he sketches out his scholarly network. Schramm’s connections to Britain were resumed in the 1950s, but were not quite the same as before the war, and there were reservations in the English reception of his work. Reviewing *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik*, Martin R. Holmes (1905–1997) found in Schramm’s ‘references to English history and the English Regalia […] many misinterpretations of evidence, and occasional misstatements of fact’ which,
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however, did ‘not affect the usefulness of the book as an iconography and bibliography of royal ornaments’. In conclusion, Holmes welcomed Schramm’s ‘pictures and authorities without necessarily accepting his interpretation of them all’. In the *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* the mathematician and historian of science Otto E. Neugebauer pointed out from the astronomical perspective that in *Sphaira* technical terminology means nothing to the author. Schramm’s work remained Germanocentric and followed the tradition of *Reichsmediävistik* and *Reichsgeschichte*, but Gerd Althoff and others have counted his contribution as being among the ‘new and important directions’ that fundamentally transformed ‘German scholarship’, since he

and others began the analysis of royal and imperial ritual and systems of symbolic representation that, although little informed by the semiotics or ethnography informing the contemporary work of Marc Bloch on the royal touch in France, nevertheless opened new directions in the understanding of royal self-representation and ideology.

Although Schramm aimed at a comprehensive Pan-European history of insignia, his approach remained Teutonocentric; he was not at his best when discussing the peripheries, ‘there were limits to the erudition and knowledge even of this giant among scholars’, as the Norwegian historian Arne Odd Johnsen put it.

**Vita symbolica activa**

Schramm continued his *vita symbolica activa*, to quote a phrase from his 1938 article on medieval symbols, even after the publication of his great works of the 1950s. However, Thimme’s selective bibliography of Schramm’s publications is less satisfactory. In order to obtain a more complete picture of Schramm’s pre-1963 production, it is worth consulting the bibliography which was published in his *Festschrift*, which also includes smaller notices and book reviews.

Among Schramm’s later works is his article – ignored by Thimme – on ceremonial umbrellas, which was published posthumously in a *Festschrift* for Hermann Heimpel in 1972. This wide-ranging survey, lavishly illustrated with over sixty plates, spans from ancient Egypt to the current Dalai Lama. In it Schramm suggested that the best solution for the proper study of the topic would be an international team of scholars from different fields, but realised that a ‘[c]ommittee for the Scientifical [sic] Umbrella Investigation’ would be ‘from the
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outset a hopeless venture’. Schramm further observed that in ceremonial use umbrellas were replaced by standards in the nineteenth-century Europe, illustrating this with the photographs of Emperor Wilhelm II and Generalissimo Franco in the presence of standards, and by pointing out that this topic would make yet another new field, Standartenkunde. One of Schramm’s final publications to appear during his lifetime was a brief note on the history of the flag, where he directed the reader’s attention to Hans Horstmann’s (1901–1983) article on the pre- and early history of European flags, and to the sister discipline of heraldry, called Flaggenkunde in German and vexillology in English.

Keine Schrammoide – no Schrammians

Aby Warburg was ‘both a collector and organizer’ for whom team-work was a familiar tool. Schramm followed along these lines and Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik in particular was the result of international collaboration among scholars from different fields. Among the contributors was, for instance, Wilhelm Berges (1909–1978), who has been described as ‘perhaps the most important’ of Schramm’s medievalist students. Other important collaborators were Olle Källström (1900–1983), József Deér (1905–1972), Hansmartin Decker-Hauff (1917–1992) and Reinhard Elze (1922–2000); Kantorowicz’s contemplated contribution, however, did not materialise. The study of coronation ordines became a life work for Elze. Reflecting Schramm’s Kaiser, Könige und Päpste the 1982 Ashgate Variorum Collected Studies volume on Elze’s papers was entitled Päpste – Kaiser – Könige und die mittelalterliche Herrschaftssymbolik.

Encouraging his students’ early independence Schramm did not establish any historiographical school. He did not wish to see a student of his turn into a
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Schramm’s *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* has been singled out as one of the most important twentieth-century works on the European monarchy alongside of Kantorowicz’s *The King’s Two Bodies* and Norbert Elias’s *Die höfische Gesellschaft*. Whereas Ernst H. ‘Eka’ Kantorowicz experienced a revival in the 1980s–1990s – a veritable ‘Ekamania’ as Ralph E. Giesey put it – with translations of *The King’s Two Bodies* into Spanish, Italian, French, German and Portuguese, *A History of the English Coronation* (1937) remains one of Schramm’s only two books translated from the German original into English; the other is *Hitler: The Man and the Military Leader*. It is, however, worth noting that a 134-page-long partial Spanish translation of *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* by Luis Vázquez de Parga was published in 1960. In comparison, *The King’s Two Bodies* and Bloch’s *Les Rois thaumaturges* were not published in Spanish until 1985 and 1988 respectively, a

139 According to Enright, Karl Hauck’s ‘early membership in the comitatus of Percy Ernst Schramm and his contribution to Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik prepared the way for a highly distinguished career’. Michael J. Enright, review of *Die Goldbrakteaten der Völkerwanderungszeit* by Karl Hauck et al., *Speculum* 63 (1988), 403–406, at 404.
144 For an analysis of the current relevance of *The King’s Two Bodies*, see Bernhard Jussen, ‘*The Kings Two Bodies Today’*, *Representations* 106 (2009), 102–117.
fact which has been singled out as an example of the ‘influence of German historiography’ in Franco’s Spain.\textsuperscript{146}

With regard to historiographical schools, it is worth remembering David Abulafia’s caveat: ‘The intellectual pedigree of a historian is not to be sought simply’ in his immediate physical academic environment ‘but on the shelves of his or her library’.\textsuperscript{147} Dame Janet Nelson has mentioned Schramm as one of her early continental influences, who ‘opened up a whole new field which was the study of ritual and symbolism’ and whose works demonstrated ‘the very wide dimensions of this approach to cultural as well as political history’. In Dame Janet’s estimation Schramm ‘was a pioneer and a lot of people have followed in his wake and brought much wider influences to bear on it, like anthropology and sociology’.\textsuperscript{148} Schramm himself self-avowedly connected his production to the research tradition of German legal history and archaeology. Yet, František Graus estimated in 1986 that Schramm ‘hardly affected German constitutional history directly’.\textsuperscript{149} However, some resonances can be found. Miloš Vec has defined one of his research interests in Schrammian terms as \textit{Staats- und Herrschaftssymbolik}.

Discussing modern historiography of early medieval politics, Ildar H. Garipzanov has referred to Schramm’s ‘tremendous contribution to the field by scrutinizing the images and symbols of medieval rulership and state and by establishing the significance of iconographic evidence — and symbols of authority in general — for the analysis of rulership’.\textsuperscript{150} Rita Costa Gomes argues in her 2003 study of the late medieval Portuguese royal court that with regard to the problem of the ‘construction of royalty’ ‘it is important to return to the large number of classic studies of Percy Schramm and Ernst Kantorowicz’.\textsuperscript{151} While Schramm’s production is still an obvious point of reference for medievalists, the Germanophone limitation of his works has undoubtedly contributed to the fact that Schramm is perhaps no longer as obvious a reference point to Anglophone historians of the monarchy of later periods. For instance, Kevin Sharpe points out in his work on the authority and image of the Tudor monarchy that
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Kantorowicz’s the king’s two bodies model ‘has perhaps been inadequately explored for later periods’, but does not even mention Schramm, who really began the modern study of monarchical images.

Gerd Althoff wrote in 1990 that

Following the pioneering research of Percy Ernst Schramm [...] historians have not felt the need to investigate in any more detail the subjects of gestures, signs and rituals of medieval political life.

This is scarcely true any longer. On another occasion, Althoff has commented on the avoidance of the term ritual by Schramm and his followers, and the fact that Schramm’s interest was very strongly oriented towards the ‘materiality of insignia’ adding that ‘symbolic communication and rituals’ caught their attention only in the ordines studies. Nevertheless, with a reference to his use of the concept politische Schauspiel (‘political theatre’) it has been argued that Schramm should be placed at the beginning of the research tradition that started to pay attention to the theatricality of medieval politics. While medievalists now refer to ‘ritual’ as ‘the object of medieval ritual studies since the 1990s’, some remember to credit earlier foundational work done by Schramm and others.
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edited by Classen.¹⁶² Later, the conceptual approach to crown was continued by Joachim Ott, whose *Krone und Krönung* (1998) is a revised version of his 1995 Marburg thesis. Ott concentrates on the crown as a sign analysing its ‘ethical significance’ and emphasising the liturgical context,¹⁶³ but, on the other hand, with its large catalogue section Ott’s work is in a way a very Schrammian undertaking. Jürgen Petersohn and Arno Mentzel-Reuters have continued more conceptual study of crowns.¹⁶⁴

For Schramm the ‘myth of kingship’ was one of the key themes for ‘understanding Europe’.¹⁶⁵ However, his own research concentrated heavily on the outward forms and expressions of kingship. Indeed, David A. Warner has summed up that

Schramm argued, in effect, that medieval rulership could best be understood through the study of its signs, symbols, and images rather than through the institutional or constitutional history pursued by many of his predecessors and contemporaries. It was not the grittier aspects of rulership that interested Schramm, but rather its ideals [...].¹⁶⁶

Giorgio Agamben has pointed out in his work *The Kingdom and the Glory* that Schramm, Kantorowicz and others failed to ask the ‘rather obvious questions such as “Why does power need glory?”’. For Agamben *Herrschaftszeichen und Staatssymbolik* ‘is in fact an immense poem dedicated to the signs of power’.¹⁶⁷

**Chancellor of the Order Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste**

Schramm’s earlier quoted views on modern orders of merit and decorations are relevant considering especially the fact that having been appointed a member of the Order *Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste* – the most prestigious honour of the German Federal Republic for scholars and artists – in 1958, he was
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¹⁶⁷ Agamben 2011, xii, 178.
subsequently elected its Chancellor in 1963. Here too, continuity or the recreation of continuity played a central role. *Pour le Mérite* was established by Frederick II in 1740 and while its early members included some civilians, such as Voltaire, it was a predominantly military decoration. In 1842, a peace class for arts and sciences was created on the initiative of Baron Alexander von Humboldt, the bicentenary of whose birth Schramm marked with an essay, where he discussed, for instance, von Humboldt’s role as a royal chamberlain (*Kammerherr*).

In his first ceremonial address as Chancellor, given in 1964, Schramm looked back at the fate of the Order between 1933 and 1945. In his opening words he extended his greetings to the holders of the military class *Pour le Mérite*, which has not been given after 1918. Under Schramm’s chancellorship the civilian Order was in constant connection with the holders of the military Order. An interesting continuity here is that Ernst Jünger, who died in 1998, came to be the last surviving holder of this war decoration. As an author Jünger could have been a potential candidate for the civil division as well. Due to the Weimar Republic’s prohibition of orders and decorations *Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste* was reorganised in 1922 as an association which exercised the co-optive principle. The historian’s task to reconstruct the fate of the Order under the Third Reich was made difficult through the destruction of its archives, kept in the apartment of Max Planck, Chancellor since 1930, by Allied bombs. The hero of Schramm’s account was Theodor Heuss, who had marked the centenary of the Order by authoring an anonymous article for *Frankfurter Zeitung* in 1942. After Heuss became the first President of the Federal Republic of Germany, he was instrumental in securing the continuity of the Order, which rested on three surviving members in 1952.

The exclusivity of the Order was guaranteed by its *numerus clausus*, no more than thirty German and thirty foreign members (since 1990 forty) representing in equal shares the humanities, the natural sciences and the arts. Schramm recognised in this overview of the history of the Order the difficulty of estimating the lasting impact and fame of humanists and artists. It was easy for him to compile a retrospective list of persons who should perhaps have been
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168 Although there is nothing whatsoever surprising about this honour in the then West German context, Eliza Garrison has written that ‘Considering the work that Schramm was publishing in the years surrounding his retirement in 1964, it is rather remarkable that national and local political entities in West Germany choose to honour him with awards that were directly related to his scholarship.’ Garrison 2009, 220.


172 Schramm 1963/1964, passim.

173 This rule was slightly modified in 1969 so that old inactive members were not included in these figures.
elected instead of some others. After his election into the Order, Schramm began to play his role in the politics of honours. He was instrumental in the election of the Belgian medievalist François-Louis Ganshof (1895–1980) into the Order in 1959. Kantorowicz, who died in 1963, did not become a member, but this is hardly surprising since, as Johannes Fried put it, ‘Kantorowicz was not one of Klio’s heroes’ in postwar Germany. Two Byzantinists relevant to Schramm’s own research interests – André Grabar (1895–1990), who thoroughly reviewed Schramm’s major works on Herrschaftszeichen, and Georg Ostrogorsky (1902–1976), Schramm’s old friend since the 1920s and one of the dedicatees of Sphaira, Globus, Reichsapfel – were elected in the category of foreign members in 1963 and 1966 respectively. Besides the politics of election there was politics proper related to the recent German past. One of Kantorowicz’s closest friends, Sir Maurice Bowra, received it in 1969 ‘only because it was awarded by German scholars and had nothing to do with the state’, as his biographer put it. Schramm invested Sir Maurice with the insignia of the Order in the German Embassy in London.

Among the appointments during Schramm’s tenure, Panofsky’s election in 1967 has attracted most attention, at least retrospectively. Thimme describes the controversy on the basis of a Chronique scandaleuse, compiled by Panofsky’s widow Gerda. Since then the issue has been taken up in a volume of Panofsky’s selected correspondence and Gerda Panofsky’s addenda et corrigenda to it, where she laments how much space the editor of the correspondence gave to the issue. Panofsky’s election had been proposed already in 1961 and in a later proposal by Gert von der Osten in 1966 it was pointed out that his election would have a ‘wide resonance within unreconciled refugees in all intellectual and artistic fields’. Initially, Panofsky did not want to become a member of the Order as long as Schramm was Chancellor since he did not wish to be invested by ‘Hitler’s Thucydides’. Apparently, Schramm was not aware of this until after Panofsky’s death in 1968, when Gerda Panofsky wrote to him about it. However, when Panofsky was hurriedly elected so that he could be invested during his visit to Germany and Schramm informed him about the election, Panofsky replied that he was ‘particularly glad to receive it from the hands’ of Schramm, whose father he remembered with gratitude.

Among the appointments during Schramm’s tenure, Panofsky’s election in 1967 has attracted most attention, at least retrospectively. Thimme describes the controversy on the basis of a Chronique scandaleuse, compiled by Panofsky’s widow Gerda. Since then the issue has been taken up in a volume of Panofsky’s selected correspondence and Gerda Panofsky’s addenda et corrigenda to it, where she laments how much space the editor of the correspondence gave to the issue. Panofsky’s election had been proposed already in 1961 and in a later proposal by Gert von der Osten in 1966 it was pointed out that his election would have a ‘wide resonance within unreconciled refugees in all intellectual and artistic fields’. Initially, Panofsky did not want to become a member of the Order as long as Schramm was Chancellor since he did not wish to be invested by ‘Hitler’s Thucydides’. Apparently, Schramm was not aware of this until after Panofsky’s death in 1968, when Gerda Panofsky wrote to him about it. However, when Panofsky was hurriedly elected so that he could be invested during his visit to Germany and Schramm informed him about the election, Panofsky replied that he was ‘particularly glad to receive it from the hands’ of Schramm, whose father he remembered with gratitude. One of the driving forces behind Panofsky’s election
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was Schramm’s old friend Ludwig Heinrich Heydenreich (1903–1978), director of *Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte* in Munich, and it was at the twentieth anniversary of this institute, Schramm personally invested Panofsky.

![Schramm (centre) investing the Finnish architect Alvar Aalto with the insignia of the Order Pour le Mérite für Wissenschaften und Künste in the presence of Dr Gustav W. Heinemann, President of the Federal Republic of Germany (left), in Bonn, 13 November 1969 (image source: http://www.orden-pourlemerite.de/node/1095, accessed 13 December 2012).](image)

During his chancellorship Schramm ‘lived with and for the Order’, as his successor Kurt Bittel put it, seeking to enhance the Order’s confraternal character by also keeping in touch with its members outside its meetings. Schramm corresponded, for instance, with Karl Jaspers. Schramm’s contemplated book on the Order was not, however, completed. With his flair for the ceremonial and his sensitivity to symbolic forms Schramm was in his element as Chancellor. When the pacifist author Annette Kolb, who had left Germany in 1933 and become a French citizen, was elected in 1966, Schramm did not fail to mention that the badge of the Order with which she would be invested was the one which had also been worn by T. S. Eliot.

Among Schramm’s contemporaries in the Order, Hans Rothfels has been a far more debated figure in the recent German history of historiography owing to his authoritarian nationalist ideas. Rothfels, then based in Chicago, was among the scholars who had supported Schramm’s re-instatement to his Göttingen chair
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182 Panofsky’s *Habilitationschrift*, which was thought to have been lost, was recently discovered in the literary estate of Heydenreich, who apparently prevented it from being found. Julia Voss, ‘Der Fund im Panzerschrank’, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* 31 August 2012. I would like to thank the anonymous referee for this reference. As a curiosity, it can be mentioned that Heydenreich’s elder brother, Bernhard Heydenreich (1894–1978), a retired Major General, completed a Ph.D. thesis, *Ritterorden und Rittergesellschaften: Ihre Entwicklung vom später Mittelalter bis zur Neuzeit: Ein Beitrag zur Phaleristik*, at Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg in 1960.

183 Thimme 2006, 533–534.


in 1947, and it was Rothfels who gave the *Gedenkworte* after Schramm’s death in a meeting of the Order. Further honours followed Schramm’s chancellorship. He received the Grand Cross of Merit with the Star of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany (which can be equated with the rank of Grand Officer) and the Austrian Decoration of Honour for Science and Art in 1964. Although the membership, and especially the Chancellorship, of the *Pour le Mérite* brought special prestige to Schramm, it can be noted by way of comparison that Friedrich Baethgen (1890–1972), former President of *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, received the higher Grand Cross of Merit with the Star and sash of the Order of Merit of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1964.

‘History is not only a sequence of facts’

In 1970, a *Festschrift* was published for the literary historian and philologist Wolfgang Schadewaldt, a member of the *Pour le Mérite*. Among the authors were Hans-Georg Gadamer and General, Dr Hans Speidel, who wrote about his thoughts on ancient and modern generalship. When *Kaiser Friedrich der Zweite* was republished in 1963, Speidel, who was at the time Commander-in-Chief of the NATO ground forces in Central Europe at Fontainebleau, congratulated Kantorowicz – to his irritation – on this ‘marvelous, always deeply-moving work about the great Hohenstaufen’. Kantorowicz replied courteously to Speidel sending his article ‘Gods in Uniform’. Schramm’s contribution to this *Festschrift* on the literary history of the readers stemmed from *Neun Generationen*, but the point he was making is also applicable to the exchange of letters between Speidel and Kantorowicz. Reviewing Schramm’s *Neun Generationen*, Jonathan Steinberg pointed out that the ‘environmental approach to culture’ led Schramm to probe the central mystery of intellectual and literary history: the way ideas get transmitted. He argues that there is an unwritten ‘literary history of readers’ which differs very significantly from the usual literary or intellectual history. Long after the writers have abandoned a style or mood, the readers still continue it. The lag between writer and reader swells and contracts over time and the attitude of the public to its authors undergoes constant revision.
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186 For the debate see, Jan Eckel, ‘Hans Rothfels: An Intellectual Biography in the Age of Extremes’, *Journal of Contemporary History* 42 (2007), 421–446.
The focus and style of Kantorowicz’s work had moved on during his American years, but even Speidel, who was not a typical German soldier – he had completed a doctorate in 1925 and taught modern history at Tübingen between 1948 and 1955\(^{192}\) – did not realise that.

‘History is not only a sequence of facts’, Schramm wrote, ‘but to it belong also the hopes and fears with which the people accompany the facts they have experienced’.\(^{193}\) Schramm himself formulated only a few syntheses. Nevertheless, there has been no shortage of praise in the evaluations of his work. Reviewing *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste* in *The American Historical Review*, Richard E. Sullivan referred to ‘Schramm’s immense genius’. However, having reached the final volumes of the work, even Sullivan found Schramm’s *Zusammenfassende Betrachtungen* frustrating, since it was not an ‘overarching recapitulation’, but ‘a strange unigated collection of’ various materials.\(^{194}\)

As János Bak put it, ‘There is in Schramm’s oeuvre more raw material, or rather “half-manufactured product,” than “processed goods.”’\(^{195}\) Schramm was aware of the ‘fragmentary character’ of his research and stated himself in retrospective: *Ich schieb viel, aber es ist Stückwerk geblieben*.\(^{196}\) In the words of Bak, another characteristic of Schramm’s production is that ‘His works often have the character of virtual museums in attempting complete coverage.’\(^{197}\) An indefatigable collector, Schramm delighted in being a ‘troubleshooter’, who solved specific individual questions.\(^{198}\) One of his major feats in this field was the identification of the wooden chair, placed inside Bernini’s *Cathedra Petri* (Chair of St Peter), as the throne of Charles the Bald.\(^{199}\) Summing up Schramm’s scholarly contribution, Ernst Schubert underlined his interdisciplinarity, internationality, and methodological rigorosity.\(^{200}\) Nevertheless, Richard A. Jackson has pointed out that ‘Schramm’s work suffered one major shortcoming:
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\(^{191}\) Speidel’s former subordinate, Ernst Jünger, was one of the contributors to Max Horst ed., *Soldatentum und Kultur: Festschrift z. 70. Geburtstag von Hans Speidel*, Propyläen Verlag: Berlin 1967.

\(^{192}\) However, as Carl Landauer, in his ‘Ernst Kantorowicz and the Sacralization of the Past’, *Central European History*, 27 (1994), 1–25, has pointed out (3), ‘just as the two bodies of the king was a medieval legal fiction, so too the “two Kantorowiczes” is a modern fiction, for there were not so much two Kantorowiczes as one man who may have gone through a political odyssey but who nevertheless maintained many of the attachments and values of his past’.


\(^{195}\) Bak 2010, 258.

\(^{196}\) Schramm 1968–1971, 1.9; 4:1.7.

\(^{197}\) Bak 2010, 259.

\(^{198}\) Thimme 2006, 589.


Schramm, who was an outstanding historian otherwise, actually examined very few of the relevant manuscripts.201

While Schramm achieved the highest accolades during his lifetime, the posthumous impact of his research has not been on the same level as that of his contemporary colleagues Kantorowicz and Panofsky. Whereas Kantorowicz’s and Panofsky’s later production was written in English, it is somewhat ironic that Anglophile Schramm’s major works of medieval history have arguably suffered for the want of English translations. In one way, Schramm was before his time with his research topics. Yet, at the same time, he was deeply anchored to the older German scholarly tradition with its heavy emphasis on cataloguing type of compilation of information. Whether the fragmentary character of Schramm’s research was caused by his unwillingness or inability to create a synthesis can be debated.

‘Always just a mask’

In his unpublished memoirs Schramm contemplates that one person perceives of another ‘always just a mask’.202 For a biographer who has not personally known his subject the task of unmasking is even more difficult. In a letter to General Jodl’s widow, Schramm remarked that it would be difficult to write a biography about Jodl, since ‘one often wondered how he really looked like behind that mask he wore so often’.203 In the words of the subtitle of Joist Grolle’s essay on Schramm he was ‘a historian in search of reality’. This, in turn, is a reflection of two quotations from T. S. Eliot’s Murder in the Cathedral (1935), which Schramm used as mottoes in his memoir manuscripts: ‘man passes / From unreality to unreality’ and ‘Human kind cannot bear very much reality’.204

It is a matter of opinion how far a biography of a historian should extend to the discussion of academic networks and an analysis of a scholarly legacy. As this article has shown, in Schramm’s case Thimme could have said much more about the former while the latter is obviously an unending undertaking. By way of example, Schramm’s friendly relations with the philosopher and sociologist Helmuth Plessner, who left Germany in 1933 due to his father’s Jewish birth, and was since 1952 Professor at Göttingen, have been described in Plessner’s biography.205 Thimme mentions that Schramm’s second eldest son, Gottfried Schramm (b. 1929) shared his father’s interest in Polish history,206 but does not comment on the fact that Gottfried Schramm became Professor of History in 1965 at almost as an early age as his father. Schramm’s wife’s nephew Rudolf von

203 Jodl 1976, 163: ‘man fragte sich oft, wie es wirklich hinter dieser Maske aussieht, die er so oft trug’.
204 Grolle 1989, 12, 41; Thimme 2003, 229, 250.
Thadden (b. 1932) became Professor of History at Göttingen in 1969 and later Rector of the University. He has recently written about the von Thadden family estate Trieglaff (Trzygłów),\(^{207}\) where Schramm was married in 1925. The family tradition in the historical profession is now carried further by François Guesnet, a specialist in Jewish history, who is son of Ehrengard Schramm-von Thadden’s thirty years younger half-sister.

One of Schramm’s last and less-well-known publications is the 30-page long text of the lecture *Der zweite Weltkrieg als wissenschaftliches Problem*, which he gave at the University of Oulu, Finland, in 1968. Despite its brevity, it manages to capture some interesting aspects of Schramm’s self-image. Schramm underlined that he spoke about the Second World War as a scholar trying to detach himself from the fact that he was both a German and a contemporary ‘as far as it is possible for a human’. Yet, he spoke much about his personal experiences and own role during the war in the first-person plural: ‘We at the OKW Operations Staff [...]’. With regard to ‘the Hitler problem’, Schramm warned against the ‘simplification of history’. He did not place all guilt on Hitler, arguing instead that ‘there would be much to say about the collective guilt of the Germans’\(^{208}\).

However, Schramm was clearly enchanted by the closeness to power and he was not short of self-confidence. He believed that although he himself had never spoken with Hitler he was able to ‘dissect’ Hitler ‘as a historical, psychological phenomenon’ on account of his over two-year-long service with men ‘who had just been talking to Hitler’, and because he was during his Nuremberg imprisonment able to interview several of Hitler’s close subordinates.\(^{209}\) Among the questions that interested Schramm was what Hitler thought about, for instance, Charlemagne or Frederick the Great. Schramm’s interest in power and its signs – whether medieval, those of near history or contemporary – transcended his roles as a historian, soldier and chancellor of an order.
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\(^{208}\) Schramm 1970, 3, 4 (‘es wäre viel zu sagen über die Mitschuld der Deutschen’), 12 (‘Wir beim Wehrmachtführungsstab [...]’), 18.

\(^{209}\) Schramm 1970, 5.