In 2015 the Arthur M. Sackler Foundation in New York made a permanent gift of fifty-eight objects to the Miami University Art Museum in Oxford, Ohio. The objects in the gift came from the Sackler Foundation’s extensive collection of bronze artifacts of ancient Eastern Eurasian steppe cultures. In this article we acknowledge the collaboration that led to the gift, identify the objects, announce their availability to researchers and students, and sketch plans to use the Sackler steppe bronzes to advance the Miami University Art Museum’s mission as a teaching museum. Appended is an illustrated Object List. An article accompanying this one presents interdisciplinary research on one of the objects, a Xiongnu-era belt buckle plaque depicting a narrative scene.

The recent gift comes in the aftermath of an event that involved intensive partnering of curators, researchers, teachers, and students. In August 2012 the Miami University Art Museum opened the semester-long exhibition Grass Routes: Pathways to Eurasian Cultures. The traveling exhibition Ancient Bronzes of the Asian Grasslands, eighty-five objects curated by Trudy S. Kawami, director of research for the Arthur M. Sackler Foundation, formed the centerpiece of Grass Routes and occupied its largest gallery. Miami University was the last stop in a lengthy itinerary that had seen Ancient Bronzes of the Asian Grasslands exhibited at museums around North America and Europe.1

Miami’s preparations and welcome for the Sackler steppe bronzes were unusually substantial. Other highlights on display in Grass Routes included historical books, maps and engravings by Pallas, Strahlenberg, Atkinson, Abu’l-Ghazi and others; detailed reconstructions of textile grave goods from the tombs at Pazyryk and Noin-Ula by the artist Lois Hale; a 19th-century Kyrgyz reed screen (yurt décor); an exhibit on Pazyryk tattoo art curated by an undergraduate history and anthropology major; and botanical specimens of steppe plants from the university’s Turrell Herbarium. Throughout the fall semester an extensive program of events featured lectures, gallery talks, and a demonstration of bronze-casting. The program concluded with a two-day symposium entitled “The Steppes: Crucible of Eurasia,” with papers presented by scholars from the U.S., the U.K., and Russia; the participants held their discussions in close interaction with Miami University faculty and students in the audience.2

After Grass Routes closed, the Arthur M. Sackler Foundation deposited the entire set of exhibit panels, photomurals, and maps from Ancient Bronzes of the Asian Grasslands in the care of the Miami University Art Museum for possible future use in exhibitions at Miami or elsewhere. All of the bronzes returned to New York in December 2012.

Writing in her introduction to the catalogue of the Arthur M. Sackler collections of Eastern Eurasian steppe bronze artifacts (Bunker et al., pp. 7-8), Emma C. Bunker described these objects in terms of their ancient meanings and their modern profile in the art world:

Popularly known as “Ordos Bronzes,” after the Ordos region where they were first discovered and acquired, these artifacts were useful, portable...
objects — personal ornaments, horse gear, tools, and weapons — richly decorated with intricate geometric, zoomorphic, and vegetal motifs, the visual embodiments of clan and group affiliations, and the supernatural world that governed people’s lives.3

The Sackler steppe bronzes, dating from the 13th century BCE through the first century of the Common Era, span more than a thousand years of bronze working in the steppes. The works were part of an assemblage of collections that were formed in China well before World War II. Medical and educational “missionaries” like Duke Larsen, Bill and Isabel Myers and their extended Chinese-speaking families collected these small bronzes from early in the 20th century until they were forced out of China by the Japanese. The large ritual bronzes prized by Chinese collectors were too pricey for their small purses, and they treasured the small bronzes as tokens of their vacations on the Ordos steppes. In the early 1950s interest waned in Chinese and steppe art, and the early collectors were aging. So with the help of the renowned dealer C. T. Loo, Dr. Arthur M. Sackler was able to acquire the collections.

The bronzes that were taken from the steppes and sold in the markets of northern China have now found their permanent home at Miami University. In September 2014 the Sackler Foundation offered to make a permanent gift of a portion of its collection of steppe bronzes to the Miami University Art Museum. Objects were chosen to provide a chronological and geographical overview, to include objects that would benefit from further scholarly research, and to include works that were visually pleasing or intriguing. The last characteristic was intended to aid the museum in its mission to expose the university and surrounding community to a wide spectrum of art works. The objects arrived at the museum in April 2015.

The mission of the Miami University Art Museum is to serve as a teaching museum that provides a visually and intellectually challenging environment to cultivate life-long engagement with the arts. As an institution that mentors and engages scholars and students, MUAM is dedicated to developing a strong permanent collection of original art and material culture representing diverse world traditions and making those resources available through display, study, publication, and educational programs as well as experiential learning encounters. By embracing collaboration and participating in collaborative projects, MUAM establishes an atmosphere that is conducive to learning about difference through active dialogue with and about visual culture. The addition of 58 ancient steppe bronzes from the Sackler Foundation to MUAM’s collections will continue to provide an abundance of institution-defining opportunities far into the future.

Educators at Miami University and in the Oxford, Ohio community began using the Sackler bronzes for teaching and learning during their first appearance with Grass Routes. Both of Daniel Prior’s undergraduate history courses in Fall 2012 (“Eurasian Nomads and History”, “The Horse in Human History”) were held in the Art Museum throughout the semester to take advantage of the museum exhibits. Classes across the university and in the local Talawanda school district incorporated the exhibition into their course work. At the symposium that concluded Grass Routes, students presented poster sessions on their research projects. Topics included falconry on the steppes (the poster presenter, a bird handler at the Cincinnati Zoo, brought a live hawk to the museum) and images of the “barbarians” in Roman sources. The imagery of the Sackler bronzes provided material for the student researchers to practice coordinating historical, archaeological and ethnographic information, and building models of movement and change in space and time.

Starting in the Fall 2016 semester, Miami University Art Museum has placed nine of the Sackler bronzes on display in an exhibition of new acquisitions. Thereafter a selection of the bronzes will be on rotating display in the museum’s on-going Global Perspectives gallery, where students in introductory art history and world history surveys compare ancient, non-Western and indigenous art traditions. Smaller courses such as “Eurasian Nomads and History” make use of the entire collection of bronzes in laboratory exercises focused on interactions between China and the mobile pastoralist peoples of the eastern steppes, and the question of a “Xiongnu” culture in relation to written historical sources. The entire collection is available for study at the museum, and an online exhibition is being planned.4

Bunker’s thoroughly-researched catalogue, Ancient Bronzes of the Eastern Eurasian Steppes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections, remains definitive. One of the catalogue’s main achievements is that it re-integrates many of the so-called “Ordos Bronzes” (which had entered the art market in the early twentieth century without exact provenience) into a semblance of their archaeological contexts. This task required meticulous survey of objects that had come to light in excavations and publications by Chinese, Mongolian, and Russian archaeologists, with which the “Ordos” bronzes can be compared. Subsequent publications have further advanced the study of the “Ordos” bronzes. A catalogue of a different group of bronzes by Bunker
analyzes numerous artifacts that are related to the Sackler objects. A chapter by Ursula Brosseder on belt plaques in an edited volume on Xiongnu archaeology has established transregional aspects of the design and distribution of this particular class of artifact. Catrin Kost’s archaeological and iconographic survey of buckle plaques in interregional perspective is the current standard of synthesis. See the Object List below. (Bunker et al. 1997, pp. 112-299; Bunker et al. 2002; Brosseder 2011; Kost 2014).

As an art collector and patron of educational institutions, Arthur M. Sackler sought every opportunity to promote the interdisciplinary study of art, in particular by giving students access to his collections. Miami University, with its renowned commitment to undergraduate teaching, is grateful to have been chosen as the new home of a small portion of those collections. While in the latter half of the twentieth century research on Asian antiquities in the West moved from the preserve of connoisseurship into university graduate studies, today we may look ahead to the further enlargement of this vigorous field of scholarship through deeper engagement of undergraduates. Arthur M. Sackler’s overall vision accords well with the new opportunities that Miami University’s teaching museum can now provide to students to gain experience of the cultures of Inner Asia.
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NOTES

1. Ancient Bronzes of the Asian Grasslands (Grass Routes 2012) was exhibited at eighteen venues, including:

Miami University Art Museum, Oxford, OH; Aug. 21-Dec. 8, 2012

International Museum of the Horse, Lexington, KY; June 24-Oct. 23, 2011

Museum of Art and Archaeology, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO; Oct.16-Dec. 24, 2010

Mt. Holyoke College Art Museum, South Hadley, MA; Sept 2-December 14, 2008

Frank H. McClung Museum, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, TN; May 16–August 3, 2008

Museum of Fine Arts, Santa Fe, NM; September 29, 2007-January 6, 2008

Hallie Ford Museum of Art, Willamette University, Salem, OR; January 21–April 1, 2006

Samuel P. Harn Museum of Art, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL; May 3–July 31, 2005

Carnegie Museum of Natural History, Pittsburgh, PA; October 2, 2004–January 2, 2005
National Archaeological Museum, Florence, Italy; May 15–September 5, 2004
Poznań Archaeological Museum, Poznań, Poland; January 29–April 18, 2004
Römer- und Pelizaeus-Museum, Hildesheim, Germany; September 16, 2003–January 6, 2004
Náprstek Museum of Asian, African and American Cultures, Prague, Czech Republic; April 15–August 10, 2003

2. The symposium, The Steppes: Crucible of Eurasia (Nov. 30–Dec. 1, 2012) <https://muamgrassroutes.wordpress.com/symposium2012/> brought together a group of participants for informal interactions along the lines of meetings that occur typically at larger institutions or on the East Coast. The papers were both interdisciplinary in their approaches and interregional in their subject matter, mirroring the Grass Routes exhibition, which served as background and inspiration for discussions. Seven of the sixteen presentations were by archaeologists; three papers by historians, two on art history, and a paper each on comparative linguistics, comparative mythology, population genetics, and artistic reconstruction rounded out the group. Most of the papers either focused on the eastern steppes or took a trans-regional stance; two papers dealt with Central Asia. The chronological focus was predominantly in the Iron Age to Xiongnu Empire period within an overall time span that stretched from the Neolithic to the Qing dynasty.

Participants noted progress in resolving hitherto schematic east-west connections into more definite movements of goods, genes, political elites and languages (though debates will continue). They compared views of different disciplines on connections between peoples as well as between people and their environment, people and animals, people and the things they own and trade; between artifacts and oral narratives. Problematic concepts such as “shamanism” and “tribe” and cases of interstitial political powers received historical scrutiny. The papers showed that concrete artifacts are increasingly leading research beyond problems grounded in classification and periodization to new sites of analysis of value, the senses, and the “construction” of bodies, landscapes, and social and interspecies relations. The consensus among those present at the symposium was that the energy and linkages the gathering had generated were sufficient gains without the publication of proceedings in a collective volume.

3. In a note Bunker points out that the designation “Ordos Bronzes” is misleading, since the objects’ actual places of origin are not limited to the Ordos region. The “Ordos Bronzes” (also referred to as Suiyuan Bronzes) are small bronze artifacts of daily use and adornment that entered the international art market in great quantities in the first third of the twentieth century via the traffic of Chinese art dealers with mostly foreign collectors. The objects were presumably acquired from excavations and chance finds at tombs and other sites by unknown suppliers who failed to document their locations or any other aspects of their archaeological context. The name “Ordos,” referring to the region inside the great bend of the Yellow River in present-day Inner Mongolia, was attached to the bronzes by convention, but their true places of origin are more widespread. Locations and dates have been established by researchers through comparison of “Ordos Bronzes” with analogous and even identical exemplars excavated from known, dated sites with full archaeological documentation, and in some cases metallurgical analyses.

4. Interested researchers may direct requests for access to Laura Stewart, Collections Manager/Registrar, Miami University Art Museum, <stewarle@miamioh.edu>; 513-529-2235.
OBJECT LIST

THE ARTHUR M. SACKLER COLLECTION OF STEPPE BRONZES

AT THE MIAMI UNIVERSITY ART MUSEUM

The museum’s collection of steppe bronzes comprises a variety of pieces from each one of the areas and periods analyzed by Emma C. Bunker in the catalogue, Ancient Bronzes of the Eastern Eurasian Steppes from the Arthur M. Sackler Collections (1997). The following list of all the objects in the Miami collection follows the order and numbering as listed in the 1997 catalogue; Bunker’s chapter headings are also given. See the catalogue for further descriptions and literature relating to each object. Additional references to important subsequent literature (Bunker et al. 2002, Brosseder 2011 and Kost 2014) are given for objects treated in those works. Buckle plaques are dated below according to Kost (2014).*

* Information in Bunker (1997) was adapted for this list by Laura Stewart (Miami University Art Museum collections manager and registrar), Katrina Fausnaugh (MUAM undergraduate arts management intern), and Daniel Prior. Photographs by Scott Kissel.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Date Range</th>
<th>MUAM No.</th>
<th>Sackler No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>Knife with rowel pommel. Bronze inlaid with turquoise.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13th–11th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.3; Sackler no. V-2031.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Knife with ibex-head pommel. Bronze inlaid with turquoise.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.2; Sackler no. V-2030.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Curved implement with rattle and jingling pendants.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13th–11th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.4; Sackler no. V-3048.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Finial with animal head and bell.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>12th–10th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.57; Sackler no. 72.2.534.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Knife with two-ring pommel.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>11th–10th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.51; Sackler no. V-7372.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hair ornament.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13th–11th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.10; Sackler no. V-3100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Knife with ring pommel.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>13th–11th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.49; Sackler no. V-7334.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Knife blade.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>8th–7th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.45; Sackler no. V-7266.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Awl case with deer.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>8th–7th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.6; Sackler no. V-3057.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Plaque with copulating deer.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5th–4th century BCE</td>
<td>MUAM no. 2015.2.43; Sackler no. V-7196.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
73. Finial with boar mounting sow. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.11; Sackler no. V-3108.

86. Spoon with two birds. Bronze. 8th–6th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.8; Sackler no. V-3062.

93. Cauldron. Bronze. 7th–6th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.27; Sackler no. V-68.

94. Short sword with openwork hilt. Bronze. 6th–5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.19; Sackler no. V-3376.

97. Short sword with round pommel. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.46; Sackler no. V-7314.

98. Short sword with a pommel of two addorsed hollow balls. Bronze. 6th–4th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.44; Sackler no. V-7239.

103. Socketed adz blade. Bronze. 6th–5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.50; Sackler no. V-7355.

105. Awl case with openwork. Bronze. 6th–5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.7; Sackler no. V-3058.

106. Awl case. Bronze. 6th–5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.5; Sackler no. V-3055.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>MUAM no.</th>
<th>Sackler no.</th>
<th>Additional Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Garment plaque with recumbent stag.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>6th–5th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.15;</td>
<td>V-3165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Garment plaque with carnivores devouring heads.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>6th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.41;</td>
<td>V-7105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Belt ornament with two connected spirals.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.20;</td>
<td>V-3443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Short sword with flat pommel that curves to form ring-like terminals.</td>
<td>Tinned bronze</td>
<td>5th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.48;</td>
<td>V-7325</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Short sword with two inverted bird heads on pommel.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.53;</td>
<td>V-7438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Garment ornament with crouching carnivore savaging the head of an herbivore.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.40;</td>
<td>V-7092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Ring buckle with hook.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>6th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.21;</td>
<td>V-3466</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Openwork hook buckle with crouching tiger and three gazelle heads.</td>
<td>Tinned bronze</td>
<td>5th–4th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.33;</td>
<td>V-7026</td>
<td>(Cf. Kost 2014, plates 76f.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Belt plaque with standing tiger and five gazelle heads.</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>5th–4th century BCE</td>
<td>no. 2015.2.55;</td>
<td>V-7026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Iron Age in South Central Inner Mongolia**

130. Garment plaque with carnivores devouring heads. Bronze. 6th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.41; Sackler no. V-7105.

138. Belt ornament with two connected spirals. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.20; Sackler no. V-3443.

139. Short sword with flat pommel that curves to form ring-like terminals. Tinned bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.48; Sackler no. V-7325.

140. Short sword with two inverted bird heads on pommel. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.53; Sackler no. V-7438.

142. Garment ornament with crouching carnivore savaging the head of an herbivore. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.40; Sackler no. V-7092.
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161. Belt hook with chain. Tinned bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.36; Sackler no. V-7069.


186. Vehicle fitting with recumbent ram. Bronze. 4th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.58; Sackler no. 72.2.91.

190b. Bridle ornament with falcon or hawk clutching a dead bird. Bronze. 3rd century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.17; Sackler no. V-3330.


207. Belt ornament with zigzag between ball-like ends. Bronze. 6th–4th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.16; Sackler no. V-3198.

209. Belt ornament with two stylized bird heads. Bronze. 6th–4th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.56; Sackler no. 72.2.472.


218b. Buckle plaque with standing ox (pair with 218a). Bronze. 2nd–1st century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.38; Sackler no. V-7075.


233b. Original backing of 233a. Wood. 2nd–1st century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.28b; Sackler no. V-7000b.


255. Ornament with six rattles. Bronze. 1st millennium BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.54; Sackler no. 72.2.383.

257. Ring buckle formed by the coiled body of a wolf. Bronze. 5th century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.22; Sackler no. V-3475.

264. Ornament with curled-up stag. Tinned bronze. 3rd century BCE. MUAM no. 2015.2.25; Sackler no. V-3710.