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Evidence for the Austronesian Voyages in the Indian Ocean

Roger Blench

Despite the presence of undoubted Austronesian speakers on the island of Madagascar, the Austronesian world is very much characterized by the Pacific and the dramatic narrative of its settlement. Although there is credible evidence for the presence of Austronesians in India (Mahdi 1999), Japan (Summerhayes & Anderson in press), in the Arabian Gulf and in North, Central and South America the present-day absence of Austronesian speakers has tended to relegate these remarkable voyages to footnotes. Similarly, the movement of Austronesian navigators across the Indian Ocean still excites little comment, in part because archaeologists and prehistorians tend to keep to their appointed spheres. As a consequence, standard texts still repeat an increasingly outdated narrative. Recent research has altered existing perspectives on the settlement of the East African coast and Madagascar (Adelaar 2006; in press; Blench 2007; 2008; 2009a,b; Walsh 2007; Beaujard 2003; 2007a,b). It now seems likely that:

a) Madagascar was first settled, not by Austronesians, but by hunter-gatherers migrating from the East African mainland prior to 300 BC;

b) Madagascar was also reached by Graeco-Roman trading ships, which may have been trading tortoise-shell with the resident foragers and were responsible for the translocation of commensal murids;

c) there was regular contact between Island Southeast Asia and the East African coast prior to 0 AD by an unknown people using outriggers and trading in spices;

d) after a gap, precursors of the modern Malay established a ‘raiding and trading’ culture based in settlements along the East African coast from the fifth century onwards;

e) Malay ships had pressed crews of non-maritime origin from the Barito-speaking area of southeast Borneo;

f) the Malay settlements on the East African coast transported captured mainland African populations from the Sabaki-speaking area to Madagascar, primarily for agricultural labour, between the fifth and seventh centuries AD;

g) that other Island Southeast Asian peoples may also have followed these established trade routes to East Africa, accounting for a residue of non-Malay Austronesian items in the Malagasy lexicon;

h) that the Malay impact on Barito society was indirectly responsible for the evolution of the Samalic peoples, the ‘sea nomads’ of the region between Borneo and the southwest Philippines;

i) that similarly, on the East African coast, the transfer of nautical technology to coastal Iron Age cultivators stimulated the development of Swahili maritime culture;

j) that the expansion of Arab shipping in the Indian Ocean from the tenth century onwards obscured the Austronesian origins of local seafaring through the replacement of boat types and maritime terminology;

k) finally, if the Indian Ocean was criss-crossed by experienced Austronesian navigators from an early period, then settlement would be expected on many Indian Ocean islands. Although most islands were apparently unoccupied at first European contact, they may still have been reached by Austronesians and that more extensive archaeology will reveal this.

A story this complex can only be summarized in the present synthesis, which aims to direct the reader to places where the argument is made more fully and only presents detail in areas so far not covered in material published or in print.
The earliest settlement of Madagascar

Archaeology in Madagascar has so far uncovered no site earlier than the fifth century AD (Dewar 1996; 1997). It is generally assumed that these early sites represent incursions by trans-Oceanic populations from Island Southeast Asia. But evidence from palaeozoogeography suggests a very different pattern for the primary settlement of Madagascar (Blench 2007). Bones with cut-marks indicating butchery are now dated to approximately 2300 BP, pointing to significantly earlier human settlement of Madagascar. Burney (Box 5 in Godfrey & Jungers 2003) summarizes the sequence as it now appears. Following the initial arrival of humans, large herbivores were intensively hunted, reducing their density and leading to an increase in plant biomass. This increased the incidence of fires (intentionally set by hunters). This would reduce the diversity of habitats, in particular extending anthropic grasslands, resulting in a catastrophic loss of megafauna.

Part of the evidence for vegetation change is the earliest occurrence of Cannabis/Humulus pollen in the central highlands at Tritrivakely, at an interpolated age of 2200 cal AD (Burney 1987). More directly linked to extinctions is a decline in incidence of the spores of the coprophilous fungus Sporormiella, a proxy for megafaunal density (Burney et al. 2003). The most secure date for this change is 1720±40 BP (230–410 cal. AD) but a less certain earlier date of 1990±50 BP (100 cal. BC–110 cal. AD) has been recorded.

Vegetational change, faunal extinctions and numerous bones with cut-marks all point to the presence of low-density hunter-gatherers from about 400–300 BC onwards. If so, then Madagascar may have been first colonized by low-density foraging populations, similar to the modern-day Hadza of Tanzania, who would have crossed from present-day Mozambique. Beginning in the southwest, they would have rapidly eliminated many species of large lemur, and begun the process of habitat conversion in the highlands. Upon the arrival of Austronesian colonists, they were largely assimilated, surviving as the residual hunter-gatherers, now known as the Mikea or Vazimba.

Rats, mice and Graeco-Roman contact

Records of the East African coast exist dating from the classical period, although these are often difficult to interpret. The main sources are shown in Table 19.1.

In the Periplus, a first-century seaman’s guide to the East African coast, Madagascar perhaps makes an appearance in the text as the ‘Great Island of Menuthias’, a source of ‘mountain tortoises’. Menuthias had ‘no wild animals’ except crocodiles and was inhabited by people who use dugouts and sewn boats and who catch fish in wicker traps. However, Menuthias was said to be some 300 stades from the mainland (c. 67 km) and from Madagascar to the mainland at the closest point is 400 km, making the Pemba-Zanzibar archipelago another equally likely possibility. The text of Geography of Ptolemy was first compiled around AD 150; the version has come down to us represents the geographical knowledge of Byzantium in the fourth century. For Ptolemy, Menuthias is certainly Madagascar, since it was east of Prason [= Delgado?], a promontory south of Rhapton, itself south of Rhapta (Freeman-Greville 1962, 4).

Archaeology now confirms that the maritime cultures of the Mediterranean were reaching the East African islands during the era of the texts. Juma (1996) reported finds of late Roman pottery on Zanzibar contact is the spread of Eurasian commensal murids in Madagascar. Both Rattus rattus and Mus musculus are common on the island today and have penetrated even remote forest areas, where they out-compete endemic small mammals (Ganzhorn 2003; Hingston et al. 2005). Vasey & Burney (2007) show that between 2480 and 1760 BP at Andrahomana Cave (in the southeast) proportions of endemic mammals such as Macrotarsomys petteri in bone assemblages decrease dramatically, while both Rattus rattus and Mus musculus rise sharply. Despite ‘some stratigraphic mixing, a clear pattern of faunal turnover still emerges’. They claim that ‘data presented here show that these taxa were introduced prehistorically by the earliest human settlers’ but this is unlikely. A probable source would be either the Graeco-Roman traders or other players in the Arabian end of the Indian Ocean network, who were certainly active during this period. It is even possible such ships were trading with the resident populations rather than picking up turtles directly.

Early Austronesian contacts with the East African coast

Textual evidence

The literature on the earliest Austronesian contacts with the East African coast has been somewhat con-
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fused by conflation with the evidence for later settlement of Madagascar. But it is now clear that these are two quite separate events. The East African coast may have been visited by Austronesian mariners from an early period, probably prior to AD 0 (Adelaar 2006; Blench 1996; 2008; 2009b; Beaujard 2007a). Pliny (Natural History, Book XII: cap. 42) describes the Troglodytae, who buy cinnamon from their neighbours and ‘carry it over vast tracts of sea, upon rafts’ [either an actual raft, such as are used in other parts of the Indian Ocean or an approximate description of an outrigger]. Moreover, ‘they choose the winter season, about the time of the equinox, for their voyage, for then a south easterly wind is blowing; these winds guide them in a straight course from gulf to gulf’, a description of the use of the equatorial counter-current for seasonal travel.

There is no direct archaeological evidence for these early period contacts, but other indications are highly suggestive. These draw from textual, maritime technology, plant and animal transfers, disease and other aspects of material culture.

Disease

General: Populations isolated from one another for long periods usually develop immunity to particular diseases and become carriers of subclinical pathogens. When they encounter wholly unfamiliar populations, disease transfers can often have disastrous consequences. The most well-known of these stories is the impact of European voyages on the New World; high mortality among Amerindian populations as a consequence of their lack of resistance to a spectrum of pathogens. If Austronesians reached the East African coast, then it is probable that similar disease exchanges occurred, and indeed we have evidence for this. It seems that African malaria reached southeast Asia at an early period, and by return elephantiasis spread through central Africa.

Malaria: African malaria would have made a marked impact on incoming voyagers from southeast Asia. The indigenous malaria in southeast Asia, Plasmodium vivax, was probably introduced to New Guinea before the end of the Pleistocene (Groube 1993, 168, 171). However, African malaria, *P. falciparum*, is more virulent than that transmitted by *P. vivax* and the resultant illness, although non-relapsing, is often fatal. As the parasite cannot survive within its host beyond the duration of its initial infection, it requires large host populations moving rapidly for successful migration. When African malaria *was* carried across the Indian Ocean its impact on island populations with limited resistance was very serious. There is some evidence in the archaeological record for demographic lacunae which might well represent the impact of incoming *P. falciparum* in the islands of southeast Asia and the Pacific.

Malaria would have been equally serious for those arriving on the coast with the intention of remaining for a protracted period. Europeans in West Africa stayed offshore for three centuries after trade first began, only venturing inland when quinine came into use in the middle of the nineteenth century. Presumably any attempt to settle in East Africa would have been similarly lethal in the first phase. So the early wave of Austronesians must soon have learnt to limit their time onshore. The settlement of Madagascar, with its disease-free highland areas, may well have been stimulated by high morbidity on the coast.

Elephantiasis: Elephantiasis, or lymphatic filariasis, is an extremely visible condition which originated in the Pacific or Island Southeast Asia. The thread-like, parasitic filarial worms *Wuchereria bancrofti* and *Brugia malayi* that cause lymphatic filariasis live almost exclusively in humans. Elephantiasis is, however, widespread in Africa and must have been brought a long time ago, because of its distribution and ‘embeddedness’. Laurence (1968) notes ‘this infection is placed in the area of evolution of the Malay-Polynesian-Malagasy [Austronesian] language-group and it is conceivable that the disease was introduced into Africa by movements of people belonging to the same linguistic group’. Elephantiasis must be transmitted by movements of infected people. As it happens, there is at least one piece of archaeological evidence attesting to its antiquity in West Africa, a Nok terracotta (Fagg 1977, pl. 121). Fagg (1977, 11) notes other statues with possible representations of the disease and Hoeppli (1969) gives some more recent examples in African bronzes and terracottas. The Nok culture is typically dated within a ‘window’ of 500 BC–AD 500. For elephantiasis to have moved across the continent in this way must have taken some centuries, pointing to a likely introduction in East Africa prior to AD 0.

Plant and animal transfers

From southeast Asia to Africa: There are at least three staple food-crops in Africa that are considered to come from southeast Asia and the Pacific (Blench 1996).

- **Plantains** *Musa paradisiaca*
- **Water-yam** *Dioscorea esculenta*
- **Taro** *Colocasia esculenta*

These are deeply embedded in African staple ecologies and are very unlikely to be recent introductions.
Asia (Han Jianlin pers. comm.). African chickens in the forest of southern Cameroon (Mbida et al. 2000; 2001). On the East African coast, there is some evidence that Austronesian banana names were actually borrowed into Tanzanian languages. For example, the Shambala and Bondei languages of the coastal region have (hu)ti for cooking bananas which may well relate to proto-Malayo-Polynesian *punti and Malagasy fontsy (Beaujard 2003). The presence of a wild-seeding diploid (AA) banana on Pemba island is another clear anthropic introduction from Island Southeast Asia, although it is impossible to date (Williams 1949, 373; Simmonds 1966).

Taro and water-yam are similarly important in many parts of humid Africa, although no immediate date can be attached to their transmission (Blench 1996). However, it is likely that all three plants were brought to the East African coast directly, prior to AD 0. They were adopted by cultivators who then transmitted them westwards across the continent.

From Africa to southeast Asia: Crops known to have been transported in the opposite direction to Asia are much scarcer, but there is one very well-documented case, that of the winged bean, Psophocarpus tetragonolobus (L.) DC. The winged bean is so well embedded in the agriculture of southeast Asia and New Guinea that earlier writers situated its domestication in this region and evolved a series of unlikely hypotheses to account for the absence of wild relatives. However, Harder & Smartt (1992) have argued conclusively for its domestication in east-central Africa, although no dates have yet been attached to its movement across the Indian Ocean. Another possible candidate is the African yam bean, Sphenostylis stenocarpa (Hochst. ex A. Rich. Harm). This was domesticated in tropical Africa but seems to have made its way early to southeast Asia and India, where it is widely cultivated (Potter 1992; Potter & Doyle 1992).

Chickens are now known to have three centres of domestication, India, China and Island Southeast Asia (Han Jianlin pers. comm.). African chickens in Ethiopia and across a wide zone of West Africa descend from the Indian breeds. However, many of the chickens of eastern and southern Africa are derived from Island Southeast Asia and were not introduced via an identified intermediary location. Whether these were brought to Madagascar and transmitted onwards to the mainland is as yet unclear. However, Malagasy terms are borrowed from terms in the Bantu languages of the coast (and indeed across the Bantu domain) not Austronesian. So it is likely that the chicken was established on the coast by the time Madagascar was settled.

The Malay settlement of the East African coast and Madagascar

Textual evidence

Although Malagasy is accepted as a member of Austronesian, its precise genesis has been much debated. It belongs genetically to the Barito languages, today spoken in southeast Kalimantan (Dahl 1951; 1991; Hudson 1967; Simon 1988) but has undergone considerable influence from Malay (Adelaar 1995; 1996; in press). One aspect of transformation of Barito into present-day Malagasy is the presence of Malay terms for cardinal directions and other nautical terms (Adelaar 1996). This suggests either that the Barito travelled in Malay ships as crew or a separate migration of a Malay-speaking population (Beaujard 2003). Whether the Barito were crew by their own choice or were pressed remains to be determined. However, their previously non-sea-going culture suggests the latter, as does the presence of various socially sensitive Malay loanwords in Malagasy, arguing that the Barito were not in control of the migration process (Adelaar pers. comm.).

Malay ships may not have been simply sailing to Madagascar but participated in an active ‘raiding and trading’ culture along the East African coast. Medieval Arab sources point to possible semi-permanent Indonesian trading outposts. Ferrand (1907) was the first writer to propose southeast Asian identities for the islands mentioned in the Arab geographers. The East African coast was considered important enough for the ‘Waqwaq’ raiders and traders from Sumatra to mount a raid on Qanbalu (an East African island as yet unidentified) in AD 945, according to Buzurg ibn Shahriyar, Book of the Wonders of India (Freeman-Grenville 1981). The Waqwaq seem also to have settled on the Sofala coast in the early tenth century (al-Mas’udi, in Freeman-Grenville 1962, 14). Al-Idrisi, writing in AD 1154 suggests that the coastal Bantu did not develop seagoing vessels for long-distance trade until quite late:

The Zenjs [the people of the East African coast south of Cape Guardafui] have no ships for voyaging ... The people of the isles of Ziibag [here Ziibag = Western Indonesia] come to the country of the Zenjs in large and in small ships. They trade with them and export the Zenj merchandise, for they understand each other’s language. (Al-Idrisi, in Ferrand 1907)

As Hornell (1936) observed, the statement that the Indonesians understood the language of Zenj only makes sense if we assume there were Austronesian-speaking settlements on the East African coast, not merely on Madagascar.
Another piece of evidence comes from an unlikely source: the large canoes of Lake Victoria. Hornell (1928) undertook a detailed description of these canoes and showed that in a number of details of construction they closely resemble the ‘small coasting vessels’ of Java and Madura. His conclusions are worth quoting in detail.

In view of these facts and of a number of other considerations, prominent among which is the fact that the common fishing canoe of the east coast of Africa, from Mozambique to Somaliland, though differing in details, is unquestionably derived from the same type as the outriggers of Madagascar, and that this type is known nowhere else than in Java, I can come to no other conclusion than that Indonesian settlements at one time existed upon the east coast of Africa at the time of the Indonesian colonization of Madagascar; further that the origin of the canoes, equally with the double outriggers of the coast, is to be traced to Indonesian culture exercised upon the Bantu tribes of this region by Javanese settlements along the coast-settlements subsequently obliterated in the same way as was that of the Portuguese at Mombasa in the seventeenth century. (Hornell 1928, 3)

Swahili oral traditions recorded early in the twentieth century by Gray (1954) talk of a ‘cruel’ people, the Wadiba, who built quadrilateral houses and were associated with the introduction of the coconut palm. They are later supplanted by the Wadebuli, whose identification is not clear but may well be pre-Omani traders. The Wadiba could have been the Indonesians responsible for the introduction of the coconut and its distinctive methods of processing characteristic of coast today.

Material-culture transfers
Transfers of material culture from southeast Asia to Madagascar are numerous, as are patterns of social organization and aspects of religion. Traces of Indonesian settlement on the mainland are far less numerous as they have often been overwritten by the subsequent spread of Arab culture. This section summarizes a few intriguing and controversial cases, which also suggest that influences spread across the Indian Ocean in both directions.

Xylophones: The origin and spread of the xylophone has been subject to considerable discussion, not all of it well founded (e.g. Jones 1971; Blench 1982). The short version is as follows:
1. Xylophones occur with any significant time-depth in only two regions of the world, sub-Saharan Africa and Island Southeast Asia. All other occurrences (e.g. in Eurasia and the New World) are recent spreads.
contains many etymological speculations. Recent observations on the historical origins of Malagasy make it possible to develop a more definite model for the origin of Bantu loanwords. Blench (2008) focuses on the terminology for domestic and translocated animals, and considers some other areas of vocabulary in less detail.

Swahili is the dominant language today along the coast facing Madagascar as far down as Mozambique, with a variety of Bantu languages related to it in the immediate interior. Even within Mozambique, an isolated language such as Ekoti appears to originate from settlements of pre-Swahili speakers (Schadeberg & Mucanheia 2000). Swahili is part of a larger group of coastal lects often referred to as ‘Sabaki’ and Nurse & Hinnebusch (1993) contains both a history of Swahili and a lexicon of ‘proto-Sabaki’ reconstructions. Of the offshore islands, the most important are the Comores. Walsh (2007) has recently studied the Malagasy terms for wild animals and the great majority also derive, not from Austronesian, but from Bantu languages. As with livestock names, almost all are from Swahili and languages of the Sabaki group, not from the Bantu languages of Mozambique, nearest to Madagascar.

This is somewhat contrary to expectation. Historical accounts of the formation of the Malagasy population, such as Kent (1970) point to intensive interaction with Mozambique coastal peoples. However, it seems that the earlier interaction of Malay/Barito crews with their coastal interlocutors must have been much more than casual trade. To explain the dominance of Sabaki languages in the Malagasy lexicon and the rich borrowings in the field of flora and fauna, it must be that substantial numbers of coastal Bantu were carried to Madagascar, and were primary observers of the natural world. This might be because they were engaged to herd livestock or were captured and set to work to produce food. Whatever the explanation, this points to intensive interactions between the Malay/Barito and the precursors of the Swahili on the coast prior to the settlement of Madagascar proper. Malay nautical terms borrowed into Swahili independently suggests external influences played an important role in the evolution of Swahili maritime culture.

The impact of the Malay on Sabaki coastal culture
The Swahili peoples are presently identified by their maritime culture and this is usually assumed to derive from Omani sources (Horton & Middleton 2000). The Swahili, especially Zanzibaris, like to trace their ancestry to Oman, which functions as a prestige origin for cultural traits. But indirect evidence points to contact with Java as a major stimulus to nautical evolution along the East African coast. We know from the testimony of Al-Idrisi quoted earlier that the Zenj had no ocean-going ships as late as the early twelfth century, but that they were in intensive contact with Sumatra. It therefore seems credible that the initial transformation of the Swahili from land-based cultivators to seafarers can be attributed to the Malay contact. Curiously enough, a parallel evolution occurred in China; as Manguin (1980, 274) points out, China only began to build an ocean-going navy after contact with large southeast Asian vessels in the eighth and ninth centuries.

Subsequently, nautical technology on the coast seems to have undergone a revolution, due to the influence of Arab and Indian commerce and the rapid adoption of new craft. Jewell (1976) describes the many ship types on the waterfront at Mombasa, which in the 1960s were still undertaking a circular voyage between the Gulf of Aden, the west coast of India, Nossi Bé in northwest Madagascar and the Comores and on to East Africa. When Vasco da Gama arrived, all these ships were constructed entirely without nails, an ancient practice characteristic of the entire Indian Ocean region. At any rate, from this period onwards, the expansion of commerce stimulated the development of shipyards all along the coast and the virtual replacement of whatever older shipping forms were in use, with the exception of the mtepe or ‘sewn boat’ (Hornell 1941). As a consequence, it has become difficult to reconstruct older Austronesian maritime influence, even as the disappearance of dhows in the years since Jewell’s book was published have made much more recent trade patterns less researchable.

Islands in the stream
Recent research points ever more strongly to early and persistent Austronesian contacts across the Indian Ocean, both via outriggers as part of the spice trade and with the rigid ships of the Malay sea-borne empire. The later rise of Arab shipping has largely obscured this narrative in the broader history of the region and had a negative impact on archaeological survey. One of the more curious aspects of the archaeology of trans-Indian Ocean voyaging is that there is so little evidence for Austronesian (or other) incursions on the intermediate islands. The ability of Austronesian navigators to find very small islands in large expanses of open ocean is well documented, yet it seems that almost all the Indian Ocean islands were uninhabited during the first period of European contact. Anderson (2002) in a survey of Pacific islands in remote Oceania found no less than thirty which were apparently reached by Austronesian navigators but were devoid of inhabitants during the period of European exploration.5 Explanations are various:
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Typhoons, disease, lack of sustainable food and water supplies are all probable causes. The situation may be replicated in the Indian Ocean: Mauritius or the Seychelles may have been reached, but then abandoned again for a variety of reasons. Indeed, the computer simulation of trans-Indian Ocean voyages by Fitzpatrick & Callaghan (2008) suggests that it is very unlikely the voyagers did not touch the intervening islands. One reason for their abandonment may have been the lack of easily exploitable food resources. It is notable that European sailors tended to rapidly consume any readily caught resource (e.g. the dodo) and bring in and release often destructive species such as the goat in order to ensure future food supplies. In the case of the Maldives, no Austronesian language is spoken there today. However, as both Hornell (1920, 230) and Manguin (1985, 12) argue, constructional techniques in boat-building point unambiguously to early Austronesian contact.

It seems increasingly likely that the lack of evidence for Austronesian landings is an artefact of the patchy archaeology. Creating a checklist of possible landing sites or failed colonization attempts may help to recover this intriguing period. Table 19.2 is intended to highlight the extremely uneven record of archaeology in this region and to establish the parameters of a programme to put their settlement and colonization on a sounder footing. Mitchell (2004) has surveyed existing knowledge of the prehistory of Africa’s offshore islands and this summary is indebted to his results for the relevant ones.

The southern Indian Ocean islands consist of Amsterdam Island, Crozet Islands, Heard Island, Kerguelen Islands, Marion Island, McDonald Islands, Prince Edward Islands and Saint-Paul Island. These are generally extremely cold and windswept and although Austronesian settlement is not impossible, it seems extremely unlikely.

### Table 19.2. Possible Indian Ocean sites for Austronesian and other settlement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Possible Austronesian contact</th>
<th>Possible other contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Indian Ocean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andaman Islands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashmore &amp; Cartier Islands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Island</td>
<td>Yes but negative survey</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocos &amp; Keeling Islands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirk Hartog Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houtman Abrolhos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langkawi Islands</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentawai Islands</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mergui Archipelago</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nias Island</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicobar Islands</td>
<td>Yes; currently settled by Austronesian speakers</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penang</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Phi Islands</td>
<td>Yes; currently settled by Thai speakers</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phuket</td>
<td>Yes; currently settled by Thai speakers</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simeulue Island</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weh Island</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Indian Ocean</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agalega</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albatross Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Possible Austronesian contact</th>
<th>Possible other contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aldabra</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassas da India</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazaruto Archipelago</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cargados Carajos</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chagos Archipelago</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>Currently part-settled by Austronesian speakers</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego Garcia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europa Island</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glorioso Islands</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Nova Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshadweep Archipelago</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamu Archipelago</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Currently settled by</td>
<td>Austronesian speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mafia Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayotte</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pate</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemba</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quirimbas Archipelago</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réunion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodrigues</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Arabs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanga</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socotra Islands</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tromelin Island</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Doubtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanzibar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Numerous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synthesis and conclusions

An accumulation of evidence suggests that there were direct Austronesian contacts with the East African coast prior to AD 0 unconnected with the settlement of Madagascar. This includes textual sources, maritime technology, plant and animal transfers, disease and other aspects of material culture. If we accept Pliny’s account, then these were direct voyages by outrigger that brought spices and took back Graeco-Roman manufactures, making use of the equatorial counter-current.

This should be distinguished from later contact with the coast, initiated from the Malay-speaking area which probably begins from the sixth century onwards. Despite the absence of Austronesian-speaking populations on the mainland today, it is likely that a trading and raiding culture existed between the sixth and twelfth centuries. It would have been responsible for the transport of the Barito- and Sabaki-speaking peoples to Madagascar, originating the complex culture that exists there today.

In archaeology, you find what you seek, and evidence for the Austronesian crossings of the Indian Ocean has hardly been sought. Further work should uncover evidence for both settlements on the East African mainland and traces of temporary landings on the many intervening islands apparently unoccupied at first European contact.

Notes


2. Thanks to Natalie Vasey who forwarded a poster version of this presentation and corrected my summary of it.

3. This section has been completely rewritten in the light of as yet unpublished research by ILRI, based on a sample of >500 chickens worldwide, presented by Han Jianlin at the SAFA meeting in Frankfurt, September 2008.

4. Albeit turned around 90°.

5. These were approximately: five in the Pitcairn-Henderson Islands region, eight in the New Zealand region, one in New Caledonia, one in Tonga, three in the Cooks-Societies, eight-nine in the Equatorial islands region, four in Hawaii.
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