UC Santa Cruz
UC Santa Cruz Previously Published Works

Title

Ancient DNA reveals five streams of migration into Micronesia and matrilocality in early Pacific seafarers.

Permalink

Journal

Authors

Liu, Yue-Chen
Hunter-Anderson, Rosalind
Cheronet, Olivia
et al.

Publication Date

DOI

Peer reviewed

Ancient DNA Reveals Five Streams of Migration into Micronesia and Matrilocality in Early Pacific Seafarers

Yue-Chen Liu[1,2], **Rosalind Hunter-Anderson**[3], **Olivia Cheronet**[4], **Joanne Eakin**[5], **Frank Camacho**[6], **Michael Pietrusewsky**[7], **Nadin Rohland**[1,8], **Alexander Ioannidis**[9,10], **J. Stephen Athens**[11], **Michele Toomay Douglas**[11], **Rona Michi Ikehara-Quebral**[11], **Rebecca Bernardos**[1], **Brendan J. Culleton**[12], **Matthew Mah**[1,8,13], **Nicole Adamski**[1,13], **Nasreen Broomandkhoshbacht**[1,13], **Kimberly Callan**[1,13], **Ann Marie Lawson**[1,13], **Kirsten Mandl**[4], **Megan Michel**[1,13], **Jonas Oppenheimer**[1,13], **Kristin Stewardson**[1,13], **Fatma Zalzala**[1,13], **Kenneth Kidd**[14], **Judith Kidd**[14], **Theodore G. Schurr**[15], **Kathryn Auckland**[16], **Adrian V. S. Hill**[16,17], **Alexander J. Mentzer**[16,18], **Consuelo D. Quinto-Cortés**[19], **Kathryn Robson**[20], **Douglas J. Kennett**[21], **Nick Patterson**[2,8], **Carlos D. Bustamante**[10,22,27], **Andrés Moreno-Estrada**[19], **Matthew Spriggs**[23,24], **Miguel Vilar**[25], **Mark Lipson**[1,2], **Ron Pinhasi**[4,26], **David Reich**[1,2,8,13]

[1]Department of Genetics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

[2]Department of Human Evolutionary Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

[3]Independent Researcher, Albuquerque, NM 87106, USA

[4]Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, University of Vienna, Vienna 1030, Austria

[5]Independent Researcher, Albuquerque, NM 87107, USA

[6]Department of Biology, University of Guam, Mangilao 96923, Guam

[7]Department of Anthropology, University of Hawai'i at M noa, Honolulu, HI 96822, USA

[8]Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA

[9]Institute for Computational and Mathematical Engineering, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

[10]Department of Biomedical Data Science, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Materials and Methods

Supplementary Text

Figs. S1 to S23

Tables S1 to S38

References (40–126)

[11]International Archaeological Research Institute, Inc., Honolulu, HI 96826, USA.

[12]Institutes of Energy and the Environment, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA

[13]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02115, USA

[14]Department of Genetics, Yale Medical School, New Haven, CT 06520, USA

[15]Department of Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

[16]Wellcome Centre for Human Genetics, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7BN, UK

[17]The Jenner Institute, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7DQ, UK

[18]Big Data Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre for Health Information and Discovery, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7LF, UK

[19]National Laboratory of Genomics for Biodiversity (LANGEBIO), Unit of Advanced Genomics, CINVESTAV, Irapuato 36821, Mexico

[20]MRC Weatherall Institute of Molecular Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 9DS, UK

[21]Department of Anthropology, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA

[22]Center for Computational, Evolutionary and Human Genomics (CEHG), Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

[23]School of Archaeology and Anthropology, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia

[24]Vanuatu National Museum, Vanuatu Culture Centre, P.O. Box 184, Port Vila, Vanuatu

[25]Department of Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA

[26]Human Evolution and Archaeological Sciences, University of Vienna, Vienna 1030, Austria.

[27]Current Address: Galatea Bio, Inc. 975 W 22nd St. Hialeah, FL 33010, USA

Abstract

Micronesia began to be peopled earlier than other parts of Remote Oceania, but its inhabitants' origins remain unclear. We generated genome-wide data from 164 ancient and 112 modern individuals. Analysis reveals five migratory streams into Micronesia. Three are East Asian-related, one is Polynesian, and a fifth is a Papuan source related to mainland New Guineans which is different from the New Britain-related Papuan source for southwest Pacific populations, but similarly derived from male migrants ~2500–2000 years ago. People of the Mariana Archipelago may derive all their pre-colonial ancestry from East Asian sources, making them the only Remote Oceanians without Papuan ancestry. Female-inherited mitochondrial DNA was highly differentiated across early Remote Oceanian communities but homogeneous within, implying matrilocal practices whereby women rarely moved households after marriage.

One Sentence Summary:

Early Remote Oceanians were matrilocal, and the expansion into Micronesia was independent from and more complex than that into the southwest Pacific.

Introduction

Modern humans arrived in Near Oceania at least 47000 years before present (BP), and spread through Australia, New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago, and the Solomon Islands (1, 2). After 3500–3300 BP, humans expanded into previously unoccupied Remote Oceania (Fig. 1A).

In the southwest Pacific, the earliest archaeological sites are associated with artifacts of the Lapita complex, appearing in the Bismarck Archipelago as early as ~3350 BP, and reaching the unoccupied islands of Remote Oceania by 3000–2850 BP (3, 4). Ancient DNA from 11 individuals from Vanuatu and Tonga 3000–2500 BP indicates that these pioneers were related distantly to Neolithic southeastern Chinese (5), more closely related to Neolithic and Iron Age people of Taiwan (6), and most closely related to the ancestors of present-day north-central Philippine groups such as Kankanaey Igorot (7–10). However, the primary ancestry of many southwest Pacific Islanders today is 'Papuan' (our term describing the primary ancestry of peoples of New Guinea, the Bismarck Archipelago, and the Solomon Islands), which genetic data has shown is due to a secondary expansion that began ~2500 BP (7–10).

The first people to reach the Mariana Archipelago arrived around 3500–3200 BP (11–14). Their material culture (15) differed markedly from the Lapita assemblages in the southwest Pacific, with Marianas Redware ceramics being more similar to those found at sites in the Philippines and at the northern tip of Sulawesi (16). This study uses a revised chronology for the archaeology of the Mariana Islands that terms the earliest three periods of occupation from 3500–1600 BP "Unai" (table S1). The burials we analyze date to 2800–2200 BP (Middle to Late Unai), and thus are not guaranteed to reflect the ancestry profile of Early Unai inhabitants. After 1100 BP, distinctive megaliths (*latte*) began to appear in the Mariana Islands, along with other material cultural changes marking the "Latte" period. The oldest evidence of human occupation in Palau in Western Micronesia dates to ~3000 BP (17). The oldest evidence in Central Micronesia is ~2000 BP; ceramics at these sites are similar to late Lapita pottery and shell artifacts, and thus could reflect roots in earlier Lapita cultures in either northern New Guinea or in the southwest Pacific (18, 19).

Linguistic relationships among Malayo-Polynesian (MP) languages that comprise all Austronesian languages outside of Taiwan provide an independent source of information about the cultural and geographic origins of Micronesian peoples (fig. S1). The CHamoru (20) language spoken by the indigenous people of the Mariana Islands is a first-order branch within MP, while Palauan is another. All other Micronesian languages and languages of the southwest Pacific and Polynesia comprise a third major branch, Central-Eastern

Malayo-Polynesian (CEMP) (21–23). Most Micronesian CEMP languages form a Nuclear Micronesian subgroup, hypothesized to have developed somewhere between the Admiralty Islands and Vanuatu, and to have spread near the end of the Lapita period ~2500 BP (24). By contrast, Yap's language is believed to be an early offshoot of Proto-Oceanic derived directly from proto-languages that branched during the Lapita expansion, although Yapese was also subsequently affected by borrowings from other languages (25). The people of Kapingamarangi and Nukuoro atolls in the Caroline Islands speak Polynesian languages, suggesting replacement of the original languages by Polynesian immigration (26, 27).

To test alternative models of population history, we generated genome-wide ancient DNA data for 164 individuals from five archaeological sites, and co-analyzed them with published data from two ~2200 BP individuals from Guam (28). A total of 109 individuals (2800–300 BP) were from the Unai and Latte periods in Guam, 46 (600–200 BP) from the Latte period in Saipan, and 11 (500–300 BP) from Na Island and the nearby Nan Madol site in Pohnpei's protected lagoon in Central Micronesia (20).

We prepared samples in clean rooms, extracted DNA, built sequencing libraries, enriched for a common panel of ~1.2 million single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), and sequenced (20). For individuals with evidence of high contamination, we restricted analysis to sequences with evidence of characteristic ancient DNA damage (20). The analyzed individuals had a median of 558,971 SNPs with data (table S2). We also genotyped 112 present-day Micronesians mainly from Guam, Palau, Chuuk, and Pohnpei (tables S3 and S4). We obtained 31 direct radiocarbon dates 30 of which were on the same samples we analyzed for DNA (tables S5 and S6). We co-analyzed our newly produced data with published data from 95 prehistoric individuals and 1642 present-day individuals from globally diverse populations (table S7).

Overview of Population Structure

We carried out principal component analysis (PCA) (Fig. 1B and figs. S2 to S3), by computing axes using shotgun data of present-day Dai (southern China), Nasioi (Solomon Islands), and New Guineans (from the Eastern Highlands and Middle Sepik areas), and then projecting other individuals. The first PC corresponds to the proportion of East Asian associated ancestry, henceforth "First Remote Oceanian (FRO)" (PC1; lower on left, higher on right), while the second PC differentiates Papuan ancestry from the Solomon Islands to New Guinea (PC2; up to down). The Unai, Latte, and Lapita individuals cluster with present-day people from the Philippines (Kankanaey) and Taiwan (Ami and Atayal) on the right, corresponding to high East Asian-associated ancestry. Two clines are visible. The first (dashed blue) links groups with high proportions of FRO ancestry to New Britain, Vanuatu, and Polynesia, while the second (dashed gray) links to groups from New Guinea, the Admiralty Islands, Palau, and a genetically homogeneous group of Central Micronesians (Chuuk, Pohnpei, and prehistoric Pohnpei). This suggests admixture in variable proportions between FRO and Papuan ancestry from at least two different sources—more related to New Britain in the first case and New Guinea in the second. f_3-statistics reveal patterns qualitatively similar to PCA (fig. S4 and table S8).

We also computed the symmetry statistic f_4(X, Kankanaey Igorot; New Guinea Highlanders, Dai) to test which individuals had significant Papuan admixture (using Kankanaey as a baseline with no evidence of Papuan ancestry) (table S9). Unai and Latte individuals had little or no Papuan ancestry (Z<3 except for four Latte individuals). Lapita individuals from Vanuatu and Tonga had a small but non-zero proportion of Papuan ancestry (0.4–4.4% and 3.3–7.7%) (Fig. 4A) (7–10). Papuan admixture was present in all prehistoric and present-day individuals from Pohnpei (~27%), and all present-day people from Chuuk (~27%) and Palau (~38%) (Fig. 4B). In modern CHamoru, the inferred Papuan ancestry is consistent with zero, making CHamoru the only genetically analyzed indigenous Remote Oceanian group without evidence of such ancestry.

Unsupervised clustering using ADMIXTURE recapitulates the patterns in PCA and differentiates the FRO components of First Remote Oceanians (we show K=9 clusters in Fig. 2; see also figs. S5 to S8). Two clusters correspond to East Asian-associated ancestry, with a light gray component maximized in Lapita individuals, and a dark gray component maximized in Mariana individuals. Pohnpei and Chuuk in Central Micronesia primarily have a light gray Lapita-associated component. Modern CHamoru of Guam is the population with the highest proportion of dark gray, suggesting local continuity. Palau and Central Micronesia only have the green Papuan-associated component maximized in New Guinea, without the orange/blue/green mixture characteristic of New Britain, the southwest Pacific, and Polynesia, suggesting previously undocumented Papuan spreads into Micronesia.

Evidence for at least Five Streams of Migration into Micronesia

To determine the minimum number of migration streams into Micronesia needed to explain the data, we computed a statistic f_4(X, New Guinea Highlanders; Kankanaey Igorot, Australian), proportional to FRO ancestry, and correlated it to statistics sensitive to different types of East Asian and Papuan-associated ancestry (9).

(M1-M3) *Three streams of FRO migration into Micronesia including a previously unknown lineage.* We plotted a statistic measuring affinity to the two previously identified (7, 28) lineages $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ and $FRO_{Marianas}$, specifically, f_4(X, New Guinea Highlanders; Lapita, Unai) against our statistic measuring overall FRO ancestry proportion. All populations from the southwest Pacific and Polynesia fall on a line with a positive slope implying closer affinity to Lapita than to Unai consistent with the Lapita-associated lineage being the source of their East Asian-associated ancestry (all residuals |Z|<2 after regression, Fig. 3B and fig. S9B). Individuals from Central Micronesia (Pohnpei, Chuuk, and some other present-day Micronesians) also closely track the line (all residuals |Z|<2), suggesting FRO ancestry from the Lapita expansion. In contrast, present-day individuals from Palau and the Mariana Islands yield negative f_4-statistics (all residuals |Z|>4), implying FRO sources less closely related to the Lapita individuals (tables S12 and S13). We confirmed with f_4-symmetry statistics that all the prehistoric Remote Oceanian groups with nearly entirely East Asian-associated ancestry (Lapita, Unai, and Latte) descend from a common ancestral FRO population (table S22), which split earlier from the ancestors of indigenous and Iron Age Taiwanese, and even earlier from those of Kankanaey Igorot. A surprise is that despite the fact that the Latte and Unai individuals share more alleles with each other than either does

with Lapita, there is not a simple tree relating these three groups, with the statistic f_4(Latte, Unai; Lapita, diverse East Asians) yielding many significant negative Z values (maximum |Z|>4, table S26). This can only be explained if the Latte individuals harbor admixture from a basal FRO lineage, which split from the lineages ancestral to Unai and Lapita before they separated from each other, a scenario that fits the data in explicit admixture graph modeling (Fig. 4C and figs. S12 to S15). We call this third lineage FRO$_{Palau}$ since the proportion of this lineage is maximized in modern Palauans (where we estimate it contributes 62% ancestry versus 15% in Latte individuals) (fig. S13A).

(M4) *A previously unknown stream of Papuan migration into Micronesia.* We computed f_4(X, Dai; Nasioi, New Guinea Highlanders), where the latter two populations are differentiated Papuan groups, and plotted it against our statistic measuring FRO proportion. Modern and prehistoric groups from the southwest Pacific and Polynesia fall on a line that also includes New Britain (all residuals |Z|<2, Fig. 3A and fig. S9A), consistent with ancestry from a New Britain associated source we call Papuan$_{NewBritain}$ (8–10). In contrast, all prehistoric and present-day individuals from Micronesia with evidence of Papuan ancestry fall below the line (all residuals |Z|>4), mirroring the two-cline pattern in the PCA (tables S10 and S11). When we fit a separate line for Micronesians, New Guinea and the Admiralty Islands, we observe no outliers with |Z|<2, consistent with a previously unknown spread of Papuan ancestry from a lineage Papuan$_{NewGuinea}$ more closely related to New Guinea and the Admiralty Islands on its northern fringe.

(M5) *Polynesian gene flow into Micronesia.* We computed f_4(X, Tolai; Kankanaey Igorot, diverse Polynesians) (tables S14 to S20), and plotted it against our f_4-statistic proportional to FRO ancestry (figs. S10 and S11), a procedure that provides a sensitive test of Polynesian-specific admixture. Late prehistoric individuals from Pohnpei closely track the baseline, providing no evidence of Polynesian admixture. One present-day Micronesian (Jk2812) deviates from the line (maximum |Z|=3.3) (table S21). We do not have a record of the island from which this individual came, so characterization of the Polynesian impact on Micronesia will require further sampling.

A Working Model for Micronesian Population History

We started with a model previously used to study southwest Pacific lineages (8, 9), and then added lineages and admixture events, testing alternative models for fit (Fig. 4C and figs. S12 to S15). With so many populations, the space of possible admixture graph topologies is vast and the topology we show is unlikely to be a unique fit to the f-statistics. Nevertheless, identifying an admixture graph model is useful in order to demonstrate that all the features described in our analysis of individual f-statistics can jointly fit the data. We confirmed key inferences about admixture proportions and closest phylogenetic relatives of analyzed groups using *qpWave/qpAdm* (tables S22 to S25), which does not require making specific assumptions about deep phylogenetic relationships, and allows us to test if there are any groups that harbor genetic drift that is not present in the populations used as proxies for their ancestry (20). Finally, we used admixture linkage disequilibrium to estimate the ages of some detected admixture events with the software DATES (Fig. 4D and table S27).

(i)   The Mariana Islands: Distinctive FRO ancestry without Papuan admixture.
—The Unai individuals from Guam whose radiocarbon dates range from 2800–2200 BP
derive from the $FRO_{Marianas}$ lineage (M1) and have homogeneous ancestry. Later Latte
individuals from Guam and Saipan after 700 BP derive ~85% of their ancestry from the
same source (fig. S13A), with substantial continuity also confirmed by their harboring
the same mitochondrial haplogroups E1/E2 seen in the Unai period. The Latte individuals
also derived ~15% ancestry from a previously unidentified FRO_{Palau} lineage (M2), which
we estimate mixed with $FRO_{Marianas}$ 45–50 generations before the Latte individuals lived
(2400–1700 BP assuming 28 years per generation). The admixture date shows this migration
and mixture process cannot be invoked to explain the origin of the *latte* archaeological
phenomenon in Mariana Islands, which began much later at ~1100 BP.

The modern CHamoru from Guam are admixed with European (~19%) and Native
American (~9%) ancestry (Fig. 4B), plausibly associated with Spanish colonial activities
from the mid-16th century onwards (29). Their remaining ancestry is entirely FRO. While
our analyses of modern CHamoru did not allow us to unambiguously determine their FRO
source, they show a greater genetic affinity to $FRO_{Marianas}$ than to $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ (Fig.
3B), and their mitochondrial haplogroups E1 and E2 are also found in the Unai and Latte
individuals, suggesting they derived much of their East Asian-associated ancestry from
earlier groups in Guam.

(ii)   Palau: Mixture of FRO_{Palau} and $Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry.—Present-day
Palauans are inferred to have ~62% FRO_{Palau} ancestry (M2) from the same lineage
that admixed in smaller proportion into the Latte individuals (fig. S13A), and ~38%
$Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry (M4). We estimate the date of FRO_{Palau}-$Papuan_{NewGuinea}$
admixture to be ~2500–2200 BP, suggesting the possibility of Papuan migration into this
region by this time.

(iii)   Central Micronesia: Mixture of $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ and $Papuan_{NewGuinea}$.
—We infer genetic homogeneity in central Micronesia over space and time, with Pohnpei
and Chuuk having similar proportions of ~73% $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ (M3) and ~27%
$Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry (M4) and forming a clade with the 11 individuals from prehistoric
Pohnpei (Fig. 4B). $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ is a better single-source proxy for the primary
First Remote Oceanian ancestry in Central Micronesia than $FRO_{Marianas}$, but an entirely
$FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ source fails in *qpAdm* when Unai and Latte are included as outgroups,
suggesting that both $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ and $FRO_{Marianas}$ contributed. These findings also
shed light on the origins of Nuclear Micronesian languages. Central Micronesians lack
the Papuan ancestry predominant in the Solomon Islands, providing evidence against one
of the three main candidate geographic regions (24). They also lack the $Papuan_{NewBritain}$
signature ubiquitous in Vanuatu by the time of the peopling of Central Micronesia, providing
evidence against another candidate region. Instead, *qpAdm* shows that the people of Manus
are a significantly better proximate source for the $Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry than those of
mainland New Guinea (table S24), increasing the likelihood of the third candidate—the
Admiralty Islands—as the source for these languages and for the stream of migration that
brought them. This should not be interpreted as implying that people specifically from

Manus Island were the true source, but rather that the source was probably a genetically similar population from the Admiralty Islands or a coastal region along the northern fringe of mainland New Guinea.

We infer dates of FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$-Papuan$_{NewGuinea}$ mixture in Chuuk and Pohnpei of 2100–1800 BP, showing that these lineages came into contact at least by the time of the peopling of Central Micronesia around 2000 BP and raising the possibility that the M3 and M4 lineage expansions into Central Micronesia came as part of an already mixed stream of people speaking early Nuclear Micronesian. An alternative, however, would accommodate a different perspective on the origins of Nuclear Micronesian languages, allowing M3 to have come from an FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$ group speaking a Southeast Solomonic language (30), to be joined later by an M4 Papuan-Admiralties group that did not displace already established Nuclear Micronesian languages. Such a scenario of language continuity despite population replacement would parallel the situation posited for Vanuatu (8, 9). We do not yet have data from Yap but, given that Yapese is an earlier branching Proto-Oceanic language, we hypothesize that the indigenous Yap Islanders might derive from a different mixture of source populations than other Central Micronesians.

Matrilocality in Early Pacific Islanders

We noticed a remarkable degree of mitochondrial DNA differentiation between the FRO$_{Marianas}$ and the FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$ lineages. All of the Unai individuals with mitochondrial haplogroup determinations and without evidence of high contamination carried haplogroups E1 and E2 (table S2), whereas all of the Lapita individuals had haplogroup B4 (7–10). All three haplogroups were found in Iron Age Taiwanese (5, 6), consistent with their being relatively undrifted descendants of a population also ancestral to the Unai and Lapita individuals. Such a high level of mitochondrial differentiation is surprising given the intermediate degree of autosomal differentiation ($F_{ST} = 0.083$) between the Unai and Lapita groups, raising the possibility of greater genetic drift on the maternal than paternal line during the early divergence and radiation of FRO lineages.

We carried out simulations to determine the probability that completely different mitochondrial macrohaplogroups spread over the two populations since they diverged, under the null assumption that males and females had the same demographic behavior and given the observed genetic drift on the autosomes (fig. S16). This null hypothesis is rejected ($P = 0.0014$, Fisher's exact test) (31). The P-values are not sensitive to assumptions about the split time of the FRO$_{Marianas}$ and the FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$ lineages (table S28). These patterns are qualitatively opposite to those in Neolithic and Bronze Age Europe where patrilocal patterns of greater female than male mobility among households have been inferred by analyzing ancient DNA data (32, 33). Matrilocality in early Remote Oceanians has been hypothesized based on genetic and ethnographic studies of present-day communities many of which have matrilocal marriage practices (34, 35). Our results provide direct evidence that this was the predominant early cultural practice.

These findings concerning matrilocality among the ancestors of Lapita and Unai individuals with little if any Papuan ancestry are not related to previous evidence of sex-biased admixture between Papuan and FRO ancestry in some Pacific populations (7). However,

a new finding of this study does concern sex-biased mixture. Specifically, we find that the Papuan ancestry in Palau and Central Micronesia was primarily derived from male ancestors, based on significantly more Papuan ancestry on the autosomes than on the X-chromosome ($|Z|>2.2$–3.3) (Fig. 4E and table S29) (7). This is remarkable since each of the three cases of FRO-Papuan admixture that are now documented (Palau, Central Micronesia, and southwest Pacific/Polynesia) involved a different pair of Papuan and FRO groups. These events must have been independent, and yet all share the feature of Papuan ancestry being transmitted primarily by male ancestors.

Family Structure and Population Size during the Latte Period

We measured runs of homozygosity (ROH) of over 4 centimorgans (cM) for 113 Latte individuals with high enough quality data to allow such analyses (table S30). Only two had single stretches of ROH over 50 cM, indicating close-kin unions were avoided in Latte people. Nine individuals from Guam and nine from Saipan had at least one ROH over 20 cM, suggesting that mating pairs of close relatives such as second or third cousins on both islands were relatively common. Shorter ROH signals (>4 cM) were also abundant, implying a limited pool of reproductive partners in every generation. We estimated the size of the population from which the Latte individuals in Guam and Saipan were drawing their reproductive partners to be 315–356 in Guam and 361–424 in Saipan (table S32).

We further analyzed segments of DNA shared identical-by-descent (IBD) between the X chromosomes of male individuals (one from Guam and the other from Saipan). We identified 149 pairs of individuals who shared IBD segments of over 8 cM (table S31). This puts an upper bound on the size of the mating population in the combined Mariana Islands of $N_e=1420$ (95% CI of 1203–1712) (table S32). If there was restricted migration between islands, or if there was temporal variation in the dates of the individuals we compared, these number would be overestimates. This implies a long-term small population size or strong founder event in Latte history.

We identified 122 pairs of closely related Latte individuals (up to third-degree relatives) (fig. S17 and table S33), with 80 of 125 individuals studied having one or several close relatives.

Discussion

A remarkable finding of this study is that the phenomenon of primarily male Papuan migrants mixing with previously resident FRO populations ~2500–2000 BP occurred at least three times, as the pair of mixing sources were different in three regions (Fig. 4D). One of these migration and mixture processes occurred ~2500–2200 BP, with Papuan$_{NewGuinea}$-FRO$_{Palau}$ mixture forming modern Palauans. A second occurred ~2300–1600 BP with Papuan$_{NewGuinea}$-FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$ mixture forming ancient and modern Central Micronesians. A third occurred ~2300–1500 BP with Papuan$_{NewBritain}$-FRO$_{SouthwestPacific}$ mixture forming the ancestry of ancient and modern people of the southwest Pacific and Polynesia (7). All three mixtures were sex-asymmetric, with most of the Papuan ancestry deriving from males (Fig. 4C). Even in the Mariana Islands where there is no evidence of Papuan mixture, the inferred FRO$_{Palau}$-FRO$_{Marianas}$ mixture date in Latte individuals is ~2400–1700 BP, providing a fourth example of migration and mixture in

Remote Oceania occurring ~2500–2000 BP, well after the initial peopling events involving entirely FRO groups.

A high-resolution ancient DNA time transect in Vanuatu has revealed the dynamics of this process in the southwest Pacific, where an initial $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ migration stream likely from New Britain changed into a primarily male $Papuan_{NewBritain}$ stream in the late Lapita period, likely deriving from the same source region and following previously established communication routes (36). Our results raise the possibility of similar processes in at least two other regions. The oldest pottery discovered in Pohnpei at ~2000 BP, which resembles late-Lapita (19), provides an archaeological correlate for a spread of mixed $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$-$Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry into this region. Parallel processes could have drawn $Papuan_{NewGuinea}$ ancestry into Palau, and FRO_{Palau} ancestry into the Mariana Islands.

Our identification of the FRO_{Palau} lineage raises the possibility that the three FRO lineages correspond to the first-order three language splits in Malayo-Polynesia: $FRO_{Marianas}$ leading to the CHamoru language and associated with the Unai burials dated to ~2800 BP; $FRO_{SouthwestPacific}$ leading to CEMP languages and associated with the Lapita archaeological complex and burials dating to ~3000 BP in Vanuatu; and FRO_{Palau} bringing ancestral Palauan and plausibly the first ancestry type in Palau because mitochondrial DNA of 3000–1800 BP remains from Chelechol ra Orrak suggests East Asian ancestry (37).

The ordering of the FRO lineage splits is also important. The fact that the FRO_{Palau} lineage split first cannot be explained by the theory that there was a single First Remote Oceanian spread into the Mariana Islands (28, 38), which then gave rise to the other lineages, because in this case, $FRO_{Marianas}$ would have branched first. The theory of a Mariana population being ancestral to all FRO lineages is further challenged by the mitochondrial DNA evidence. If this theory was correct, the most parsimonious expectation is for the haplotypes observed in the Unai individuals from Guam at 2800–2200 BP (E1/E2) also to be observed in the Lapita individuals at 3000–2500 BP. However, only mitochondrial haplotype B4a1a1 (the "Polynesian motif") is observed. Therefore, our results point to a scenario in which three First Remote Oceanian lineages branched from a trunk of Malayo-Polynesian-speakers in Island Southeast Asia, with at least three independent streams of migrations into Remote Oceania.

Since colonial times, Pacific peoples have been divided into "Melanesians," "Polynesians," and "Micronesians", driven by theories of shared origins (39). However, our results show that people in Micronesia have a diversity of ancestral origins even within the same geographic region, implying that the term "Micronesian" should be used as a geographic label without implying a specific biological profile.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments:

Data and Materials Availability:

Data for the prehistoric individuals are fully publicly available and have been deposited in the European Nucleotide Archive (Project Accession: PRJEB51180). The informed consents for the newly genotyped present-day individuals from Guam, Palau, Chuuk and Pohnpei are not consistent with unmediated public posting of genomic data. Researchers who wish to analyze these deidentified data can access them through the Harvard Dataverse repository through the following link: https://doi.org/10.7910/DVN/63QFEC. Data may be downloaded after registering for a Harvard Dataverse user account, providing an email address and institutional or professional affiliation, and submitting an affirmation of the following statements: (a) I will not distribute the data outside my collaboration; (b) I will not post the data publicly; (c) I will make no attempt to connect the genetic data to personal identifiers for the samples; (d) I will use the data only for studies of population history; and (e) I will not use the data for commercial purposes.

References and Notes

1. O'Connell JF, Allen J, The process, biotic impact, and global implications of the human colonization of Sahul about 47,000 years ago. J. Archaeol. Sci 56, 73–84 (2015).

2. Wickler S, Spriggs M, Pleistocene human occupation of the Solomon Islands. Antiquity. 62, 703–706 (1988).

3. Rieth TM, Athens JS, Late Holocene human expansion into Near and Remote Oceania: A Bayesian model of the chronologies of the Mariana Islands and Bismarck Archipelago. J. Isl. Coast. Archaeol 14, 5–16 (2019).

4. Bedford S, Spriggs M Eds., Debating Lapita: Distribution, Chronology, Society and Subsistence, vol. 52 of Terra Australis (ANU Press, 2019).

5. Yang MA et al. , Ancient DNA indicates human population shifts and admixture in northern and southern China. Science. 369, 282–288 (2020). [PubMed: 32409524]

6. Wang C-C et al. , Genomic insights into the formation of human populations in East Asia. Nature. 591, 413–419 (2021). [PubMed: 33618348]

7. Skoglund P et al. , Genomic insights into the peopling of the Southwest Pacific. Nature. 538, 510–513 (2016). [PubMed: 27698418]

8. Lipson M et al. , Population turnover in Remote Oceania shortly after initial settlement. Curr. Biol 28, 1157–1165 (2018). [PubMed: 29501328]

9. Lipson M et al. , Three phases of ancient migration shaped the ancestry of human populations in Vanuatu. Curr. Biol 30, 4846–4856.e6 (2020). [PubMed: 33065004]

10. Posth C et al. , Language continuity despite population replacement in Remote Oceania. Nat. Ecol. Evol 2, 731–740 (2018). [PubMed: 29487365]

11. Carson MT, First settlement of Remote Oceania: earliest sites in the Mariana Islands, vol. 1 of Springer Briefs in Archaeology (Springer, 2014).

12. Petchey F, Clark G, A R for the Palau Islands: An evaluation of extant and new   R values and their application to archaeological deposits at Ulong. J. Isl. Archaeol 5, 236–252 (2010).

13. Petchey F et al. , Forgotten news: shellfish isotopic insight into changing sea-level and associated impact on the first settlers of the Mariana Archipelago. Quat. Geochronol 48, 180–194 (2018).

14. Petchey F, Clark G, Clarifying the age of initial settlement Horizon in the Mariana Islands and the Impact of Hard Water: A response to Carson (2020). Radiocarbon, 63, 905–913 (2021).

15. Spoehr A, Marianas prehistory: Archaeological survey and excavations on Saipan, Tinian and Rota, vol. 48 of Fieldiana Anthropology. (Chicago Natural History Museum, 1957).

16. Clark GR, Winter O, "The ceramic trail: Evaluating the Marianas and Lapita West Pacific connection" in Debating Lapita: Distribution, Chronology, Society and Subsistence, Bedford S, Spriggs M Eds., vol. 52 of Terra Australis (ANU Press, 2019), pp. 37–59.

17. Rieth T, Cochrane EE, "The chronology of colonization in Remote Oceania" in The Oxford Handbook of Prehistoric Oceania, Cochrane EE, Hunt TL, Eds. (Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 133–161.

18. Shutler R Jr., "The relationship of red-slipped and lime-impressed pottery of the southern Philippines to that of Micronesia and the Lapita of Oceania" in The Pacific from 5000 to 2000 BP (Colonsation and Tranformations), Galipaud JC, Lilley I Eds. (IRD Editions, 1999), pp. 522–529.

19. Athens JS, Nan Madol pottery, Pohnpei. Micronesica (Suppl.). 2, 17–32 (1990).

20. See supplementary materials.

21. Gray RD, Jordan FM, Language trees support the express-train sequence of Austronesian expansion. Nature. 405, 1052–1055 (2000). [PubMed: 10890445]

22. Gray RD, Drummond AJ, Greenhill SJ, Language phylogenies reveal expansion pulses and pauses in Pacific settlement. Science. 323, 479–483 (2009). [PubMed: 19164742]

23. Smith AD, The Western Malayo-Polynesian problem. Ocean. Linguist 56, 435–490 (2017).

24. Song JJ, The migration pathways of the Proto Nuclear Micronesians: a linguistic trail. Macrolinguistics. 3, 26–66 (2009).

25. Ross M, "Is Yapese Oceanic?" in Reconstruction, Classification, Description — Festschrift in Honor of Isidore Dyen, Nothofer B Eds., vol. 3 of Abera network Asia-Pacific (Abera Verlag, 1996) pp. 121–166.

26. Kirch PV, The Polynesian outliers: continuity, change, and replacement. J. Pac. Hist 19, 224–238 (1984).

27. Kirch PV, On the Road of the Winds: An Archaeological History of the Pacific Islands before European Contact (University of California Press, 2017).

28. Pugach I et al. , Ancient DNA from Guam and the peopling of the Pacific. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci 118, e2022112118 (2021). [PubMed: 33443177]

29. Schurz WL, The Manila Galleon, vol. 40 of Historical Conservation Society (1939).

30. Blust R, Malaita-Micronesian once again. Ocean. Linguist 49, 559–567 (2010).

31. Sudo K-I, Social organization and types of sea tenure in Micronesia. Senri. Ethnol. Stud 17, 203–230 (1984).

32. Mittnik A et al. , Kinship-based social inequality in Bronze Age Europe. Science. 366, 731–734 (2019). [PubMed: 31601705]

33. Fowler C et al. , A high-resolution picture of kinship practices in an Early Neolithic tomb. Nature. 601, 584–587 (2022). [PubMed: 34937939]

34. Hage P, Marck J, Matrilineality and the Melanesian origin of Polynesian Y chromosomes. Curr. Anthropol 44, S121–S127 (2003).

35. Jordan FM, Gray RD, Greenhill SJ, Mace R, Matrilocal residence is ancestral in Austronesian societies. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci 276, 1957–1964 (2009).

36. Spriggs M, Reich D, An ancient DNA Pacific journey: A case study of collaboration between archaeologists and geneticists. World Archaeol. 51, 620–639 (2019).

37. Stone JH, "The Bioarchaeology of initial human settlement in Palau, western Micronesia." thesis, University of Oregon (2020).

38. Carson MT, Hung H, Summerhayes G, Bellwood P, The pottery trail from Southeast Asia to Remote Oceania. J. Isl. Coast. Archaeol 8, 17–36 (2013).

39. Dumont D'Urville JSC, Sur les Iles du Grande Océan. Bull. la Société Géographie Paris 105, 1–21 (1832).

40. Pinhasi R, Fernandes DM, Sirak K, Cheronet O, Isolating the human cochlea to generate bone powder for ancient DNA analysis. Nat. Protoc 14, 1194–1205 (2019). [PubMed: 30842617]

41. Dabney J et al. , Complete mitochondrial genome sequence of a Middle Pleistocene cave bear reconstructed from ultrashort DNA fragments. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci 110, 15758–15763 (2013). [PubMed: 24019490]

42. Korlevi P et al. , Reducing microbial and human contamination in DNA extractions from ancient bones and teeth. Biotechniques. 59, 87–93 (2015). [PubMed: 26260087]

43. Rohland N, Glocke I, Aximu-Petri A, Meyer M, Extraction of highly degraded DNA from ancient bones, teeth and sediments for high-throughput sequencing. Nat. Protoc 13, 2447–2461 (2018). [PubMed: 30323185]

44. Meyer M, Kircher M, Illumina sequencing library preparation for highly multiplexed target capture and sequencing. Cold Spring Harb. Protoc 6, pdb.prot5448 (2010).

45. Gansauge M-T, Meyer M, Single-stranded DNA library preparation for the sequencing of ancient or damaged DNA. Nat. Protoc 8, 737–748 (2013). [PubMed: 23493070]

46. Kircher M, Sawyer S, Meyer M, Double indexing overcomes inaccuracies in multiplex sequencing on the Illumina platform. Nucleic Acids Res. 40, e3 (2012). [PubMed: 22021376]

47. Briggs AW et al. , Removal of deaminated cytosines and detection of *in vivo* methylation in ancient DNA. Nucleic Acids Res. 38, e87 (2009). [PubMed: 20028723]

48. Rohland N, Harney E, Mallick S, Nordenfelt S, Reich D, Partial uracil-DNA-glycosylase treatment for screening of ancient DNA. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci 370, 20130624 (2015).

49. Fu Q et al. , A revised timescale for human evolution based on ancient mitochondrial genomes. Curr. Biol 23, 553–559 (2013). [PubMed: 23523248]

50. Fu Q et al. , An early modern human from Romania with a recent Neanderthal ancestor. Nature. 524, 216–219 (2015). [PubMed: 26098372]

51. Haak W et al. , Massive migration from the steppe was a source for Indo-European languages in Europe. Nature. 522, 207–211 (2015). [PubMed: 25731166]

52. Mathieson I et al. , Genome-wide patterns of selection in 230 ancient Eurasians. Nature. 528, 499–503 (2015). [PubMed: 26595274]

53. Rohland N et al. , Three reagents for in-solution enrichment of ancient human DNA at more than a million SNPs. bioRxiv (2022).

54. Elhaik E et al. , The GenoChip: a new tool for genetic anthropology. Genome Biol. Evol 5, 1021–1031 (2013). [PubMed: 23666864]

55. O'Shaughnessy DF, Hill AV, Bowden DK, Weatherall DJ, Clegg JB, Globin genes in Micronesia: origins and affinities of Pacific Island peoples. Am. J. Hum. Genet 46, 144 (1990). [PubMed: 1967206]

56. Behar DM et al. , A "Copernican" reassessment of the human mitochondrial DNA tree from its root. Am. J. Hum. Genet 90, 675–684 (2012). [PubMed: 22482806]

57. Li H, Durbin R, Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. Bioinformatics. 25, 1754–1760 (2009). [PubMed: 19451168]

58. Skoglund P, Storå J, Götherström A, Jakobsson M, Accurate sex identification of ancient human remains using DNA shotgun sequencing. J. Archaeol. Sci 40, 4477–4482 (2013).

59. Furtwängler A et al. , Ratio of mitochondrial to nuclear DNA affects contamination estimates in ancient DNA analysis. Sci. Rep 8, 14075 (2018). [PubMed: 30232341]

60. Renaud G, Slon V, Duggan AT, Kelso J, Schmutzi: estimation of contamination and endogenous mitochondrial consensus calling for ancient DNA. Genome Biol. 16, 224 (2015). [PubMed: 26458810]

61. Korneliussen TS, Albrechtsen A, Nielsen R, ANGSD: analysis of next generation sequencing data. BMC Bioinformatics. 15, 356 (2014). [PubMed: 25420514]

62. Weissensteiner H et al. , HaploGrep 2: mitochondrial haplogroup classification in the era of high-throughput sequencing. Nucleic Acids Res. 44, W58–W63 (2016). [PubMed: 27084951]

63. Narasimhan VM et al. , The formation of human populations in South and Central Asia. Science. 365, eaat7487 (2019). [PubMed: 31488661]

64. van Klinken GJ, Bone collagen quality indicators for palaeodietary and radiocarbon measurements. J. Archaeol. Sci 26, 687–695 (1999).

65. Ramsey CB, Radiocarbon calibration and analysis of stratigraphy: the OxCal program. Radiocarbon. 37, 425–430 (1995).

66. Heaton TJ et al. , Marine20—the marine radiocarbon age calibration curve (0–55,000 cal BP). Radiocarbon. 62, 779–820 (2020).

67. Hughen KA et al. , Marine04 marine radiocarbon age calibration, 0–26 cal kyr BP. Radiocarbon. 46, 1059–1086 (2004).

68. Reimer PJ et al. , IntCal09 and Marine09 radiocarbon age calibration curves, 0—50,000 years cal BP. Radiocarbon. 51, 1111–1150 (2009).

69. Reimer PJ et al. , IntCal13 and Marine13 radiocarbon age calibration curves 0–50,000 years cal BP. Radiocarbon. 55, 1869–1887 (2013).

70. Stuiver M, Pearson GW, Braziunas T, Radiocarbon age calibration of marine samples back to 9000 cal yr BP. Radiocarbon. 28, 980–1021 (1986).

71. Alves E et al. , Marine reservoir corrections on the southeastern coast of Brazil: paired samples from the Saquarema shellmound. Radiocarbon. 57, 517–525 (2015).

72. Reimer RW, Reimer PJ, An online application for R calculation. Radiocarbon. 59, 1623–1627 (2017).

73. Carson MT, Peopling of Oceania: Clarifying an initial settlement horizon in the Mariana Islands at 1500 BC. Radiocarbon. 62, 1733–1754 (2020).

74. Ward GK, Wilson SR, Procedures for comparing and combining radiocarbon age determinations: a critique. Archaeometry. 20, 19–31 (1978).

75. Petchey F, Spriggs M, Bedford S, Valentin F, Buckley H, Radiocarbon dating of burials from the Teouma Lapita cemetery, Efate, Vanuatu. J. Archaeol. Sci 50, 227–242 (2014).

76. Prüfer K et al. , The complete genome sequence of a Neanderthal from the Altai Mountains. Nature. 505, 43–49 (2014). [PubMed: 24352235]

77. Skoglund P et al. , Genetic evidence for two founding populations of the Americas. Nature. 525, 104–108 (2015). [PubMed: 26196601]

78. Mallick S et al. , The Simons genome diversity project: 300 genomes from 142 diverse populations. Nature. 538, 201–206 (2016). [PubMed: 27654912]

79. Bergström A et al. , Insights into human genetic variation and population history from 929 diverse genomes. Science. 367, eaay5012 (2020). [PubMed: 32193295]

80. Jacobs GS et al. , Multiple deeply divergent Denisovan ancestries in Papuans. Cell. 177, 1010–1021 (2019). [PubMed: 30981557]

81. Malaspinas A-S et al. , Two ancient human genomes reveal Polynesian ancestry among the indigenous Botocudos of Brazil. Curr. Biol 24, R1035–R1037 (2014). [PubMed: 25455029]

82. The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, A global reference for human genetic variation. Nature. 526, 68–74 (2015). [PubMed: 26432245]

83. Sudmant PH et al. , An integrated map of structural variation in 2,504 human genomes. Nature. 526, 75–81 (2015). [PubMed: 26432246]

84. McColl H et al. , The prehistoric peopling of Southeast Asia. Science. 361, 88–92 (2018). [PubMed: 29976827]

85. Bergström A et al. , A Neolithic expansion, but strong genetic structure, in the independent history of New Guinea. Science. 357, 1160–1163 (2017). [PubMed: 28912245]

86. Lazaridis I et al. , Ancient human genomes suggest three ancestral populations for present-day Europeans. Nature. 513, 409–413 (2014). [PubMed: 25230663]

87. Qin P, Stoneking M, Denisovan ancestry in East Eurasian and Native American populations. Mol. Biol. Evol 32, 2665–2674 (2015). [PubMed: 26104010]

88. Olalde I et al. , The genomic history of the Iberian Peninsula over the past 8000 years. Science. 363, 1230–1234 (2019). [PubMed: 30872528]

89. Patterson N, Price AL, Reich D, Population structure and eigenanalysis. PLoS Genet. 2, 2074–2093 (2006).

90. Alexander DH, Novembre J, Lange K, Fast model-based estimation of ancestry in unrelated individuals. Genome Res. 19, 1655–1664 (2009). [PubMed: 19648217]

91. Patterson N et al. , Ancient admixture in human history. Genetics. 192, 1065–1093 (2012). [PubMed: 22960212]

92. Reich D et al. , Reconstructing native American population history. Nature. 488, 370–374 (2012). [PubMed: 22801491]

93. Ringbauer H, Novembre J, Steinrücken M, Human parental relatedness through timedetecting runs of homozygosity in ancient DNA. bioRxiv (2020). doi: 10.1101/2020.05.31.126912

94. Friedlaender JS et al. , The genetic structure of Pacific Islanders. PLoS Genet. 4, e19 (2008). [PubMed: 18208337]

95. Carson MT, Palaeohabitat of first settlement sites 1500–1000 BC in Guam, Mariana Islands, western Pacific. J. Archaeol. Sci 38, 2207–2221 (2011).

96. Amesbury JR, Moore DR, Hunter-Anderson RL, Cultural adaptations and late Holocene sea level change in the Marianas: recent excavations at Chalan Piao, Saipan, Micronesia. Bull. Indo-Pacific Prehistory Assoc 15, 53–69 (1996).

97. Craib JL, Early occupation at Unai Chulu, Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Bull. Indo-Pacific Prehistory Assoc 13, 116–134 (1993).

98. Bellwood P, Wood R, Irwin G, Waluyo A, "Excavations in the Uattamdi rockshelters, Kayoa Island." in The Spice Islands in Prehistory Archaeology in the Northern Moluccas, Indonesia, Bellwood P Eds., vol. 50 of Terra Australis (ANU Press, 2019), pp. 67–76.

99. Hung H et al. , The first settlement of Remote Oceania: the Philippines to the Marianas. Antiquity. 85, 909–926 (2011).

100. Dickinson WR, Hydro-isostatic and tectonic influences on emergent Holocene paleoshorelines in the Mariana Islands, western Pacific Ocean. J. Coast. Res 16, 735–746 (2000).

101. Dickinson WR, Impact of mid-Holocene hydro-isostatic highstand in regional sea level on habitability of islands in Pacific Oceania. J. Coast. Res 19, 489–502 (2003).

102. Higham C, Higham T, Kijngam A, Cutting a Gordian Knot: the Bronze Age of Southeast Asia: origins, timing and impact. Antiquity. 85, 583–598 (2011).

103. Cochrane EE, Rieth TM, Filimoehala D, The first quantitative assessment of radiocarbon chronologies for initial pottery in Island Southeast Asia supports multi-directional Neolithic dispersal. PLoS One. 16, e0251407 (2021). [PubMed: 34077445]

104. Hunter-Anderson RL, Cultural responses to a Late Holocene climatic oscillation in the Mariana Islands, Micronesia: Lessons from the past. Hum. Ecol. Rev, 148–159 (2010).

105. Moore DR, What's new and what's cooking in the latte period pots. Micronesica. 42, 121–147 (2012).

106. Büntgen U et al. , Cooling and societal change during the Late Antique Little Ice Age from 536 to around 660 AD. Nat. Geosci 9, 231–236 (2016).

107. Helama S, Jones PD, Briffa KR, Dark ages cold period: a literature review and directions for future research. The Holocene. 27, 1600–1606 (2017).

108. Hunter-Anderson RL, Yousuf M, Rowe MW, Pictographs from Mahlac Cave, Guam: radiocarbon dating and chemical studies. American Indian Rock Art, 40, 995–1016 (2013).

109. Carson MT, An overview of latte period archaeology. Micronesica. 42, 1–79 (2012).

110. Hunter-Anderson RL, Thompson GB, Moore DR, Rice as a prehistoric valuable in the Mariana Islands, Micronesia. Asian Perspect. 34, 69–89 (1995).

111. Chappell J, Sea levels and sediments: some features of the context of coastal archaeological sites in the tropics. Archaeol. Ocean 17, 69–78 (1982).

112. Easton WH, Ku TL, Randall RH, Recent reefs and shorelines of Guam. Micronesica. 14, 1–11 (1978).

113. Carson MT, Paleo-terrain research: finding the first settlement sites of Remote Oceania. Geoarchaeology. 29, 268–275 (2014).

114. Alkire WH, An Introduction to the Peoples and Cultures of Micronesia (Cummings Publishing Company, 1977).

115. Davidson JM, Preliminary archaeological investigations on Ponape and other eastern Caroline Islands. Micronesica. 3, 81–95 (1967).

116. Pietrusewsky M, Willacker LM, The search for Father Bachelot: first Catholic missionary to the Hawaiian Islands (1827–1837). J. Forensic Sci 42, 208–212 (1997). [PubMed: 9068178]

117. McCoy MD, Athens JS, Sourcing the megalithic stones of Nan Madol: an XRF study of architectural basalt stone from Pohnpei, Federated States of Micronesia. J. Pacific Archaeol 3, 105–114 (2012).

118. McCoy MD, Alderson HA, Hemi R, Cheng H, Edwards RL, Earliest direct evidence of monument building at the archaeological site of Nan Madol (Pohnpei, Micronesia) identified using 230 Th/U coral dating and geochemical sourcing of megalithic architectural stone. Quat. Res 86, 295–303 (2016).

119. Athens JS, "Archaeology of the Eastern Caroline Islands, Micronesia." in The Oxford handbook of prehistoric Oceania, Cochrane EE, Hunt TL Eds, (Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 271–301.

120. Seikel K, Mortuary contexts and social structure at Nan Madol, Pohnpei. J. Isl. Coast. Archaeol 6, 442–460 (2011).

121. Athens JS, "The rise of the Saudeleur: dating the Nan Madol chiefdom, Pohnpei." in Vastly Ingenious: The Archaeology of Pacific Material Culture in Honour of Janet M. Davidson, Anderson A, Green K, Leach F, Eds. (Otago University Press, 2007), pp. 191–208.

122. Bath JE, Athens JS, Prehistoric social complexity on Pohnpei: The Saudeleur to Nahnmwarki transformation. Micronesica Suppl. 2, 275–290 (1990).

123. Hanlon DL, Upon a stone altar: A history of the island of Pohnpei to 1890 (University of Hawaii Press, 1988), vol. 5.

124. Lipson M, Applying f_4-statistics and admixture graphs: Theory and examples. Mol. Ecol. Resour 20, 1658–1667 (2020). [PubMed: 32717097]

125. Cox MP, Karafet TM, Lansing JS, Sudoyo H, Hammer MF, Autosomal and Xlinked single nucleotide polymorphisms reveal a steep Asian—Melanesian ancestry cline in eastern Indonesia and a sex bias in admixture rates. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci 277, 1589–1596 (2010).

126. Blust R, The Austronesian languages (revised edition) (ANU Press, 2013).

Fig. 1. Map and PCA.

(A) Map showing five inferred streams of migration into Micronesia. (B) Principal Component Analysis: axes computed with Dai, Nasioi, and Papuans; others projected.

Fig. 2. Clustering analysis.
Unsupervised ADMIXTURE (K=9 clusters). New data in boldface.

Fig. 3. Different Papuan and East Asian affinities.

Test for differential (A) Papuan and (B) FRO affinities using a merge of the 1240K and MEGA data (~169,000 SNPs) Equation (Eq.) 1 computed with all groups from Vanuatu and Polynesians; Eq. 2 with all Micronesian and New Guinea-related groups except from Guam and Saipan; and Eq. 3 with all present-day groups except Micronesians. We show one standard error in each direction on the y axis. We merged Lapita individuals from Vanuatu and Tonga. See fig. S9 for the same analysis performed on individuals for whom we have ~397,000 SNPs genotyped on a merge of 1240k and Human Origins data.

Fig. 4. Quantification of admixture events.
(A) Proportions of Papuan ancestry in FRO and Latte groups. Thick and thin error bars show one standard error and 95% CI. (B) Ancestry proportions from *qpAdm*. Each group represented by a horizontal bar and partitioned into colored segments, representing different sources of their ancestry. Error bars show one standard error. (C) Admixture graphs. Arrow pairs (head-to-head) denote admixture events. Heights of the colored bars give mixture proportions. (D) Date of admixture. Ranges show two standard errors. (E) Difference between FRO ancestry estimates on the autosomes and the X-chromosome.