

Concept paper outline

Daniel Buonaiuto, Lizzie Wolkovich, Ignacio Morales Castilla?

January 29, 2018

Green is the color of spring (Schwartz, 1998), but any keen observer walking the Eastern deciduous forests of North America early in the season would readily notice that it is often the subtle reds and yellows of emerging tree flowers that are the first harbingers of the season. Why do some tree species seasonally flower before leafing out? What benefit might a species gain by engaging in the costly process of reproduction at a time when the current year's photosynthesis unavailable to them, and stored energy is at a seasonal low (Hoch, A. & Korner, 2003; Pfanz, H., 2002)? This trait, known as hysteranthly, is a feature common to deciduous forests, and is apparent in many commercially and ecologically important woody plant species. This flowering pattern has long been noted by botanists (Rathcke & Lacey, 1985) and several hypotheses have been put forth suggesting that this temporal trait is critical for the reproductive success of these species, but there has been little empirical investigation into the origins or significance of this pattern. Further, while the study of phenology, the timing of seasonal life cycle events, has received increased attention in the past decades for its link to anthropogenic climate change, floral and leaf phenology have long been treated as disparate processes, and have been rarely observed in tandem (Wolkovich & Ettinger, 2014). As a result, though hysteranthly is reported to be common in temperate deciduous forests, it is difficult to evaluate the prevalence of hysteranthly, or even to conclusively classify hysteranthous species.

Interactions between temperature and day length are the dominant cues for both floral and foliar phenology in trees (Forrest & Miller-Rushing, 2010). Significant shifts in phenology due to anthropogenic climate change have already been observed, (Menzel *et al.*, 2006), but there is little baseline data for evaluating if and how hysteranthly has been altered (Lechowicz, 1995). This gap in the literature is particularly alarming, as seasonal temperatures are projected to continue to change dramatically as a result of human activity (Raftery *et al.*, 2017). If hysteranthly is indeed affected by climate change, climate induced alterations to this phenological pattern could have negative reproductive, and ultimately demographic, consequences for many important woody species.

In this paper we attempt to lay a groundwork for a thorough investigation of hysteranthous flowering. More specifically, in the following sections we will:

- Present and evaluate the current hypotheses on these origins and significance of hysteranthly.

- Develop an empirical definition and framework for identifying hysteranthous species.
- Characterize the prevalence of hysteranth in Eastern North American temperate forests, investigate the phylogenetic signal of the trait, and identify biological traits associated with hysteranth.
- Discuss the connection between hysteranth and reproductive uncertainty in the context of climate change, and present future research directions.

A History of Hysteranthous Hypotheses

Descriptions of hysteranthous flowering in trees seems to have entered the scientific literature in the mid 1890's (Robertson, 1895). However, several terms to describe this phenological pattern have been used variably and imprecisely (Dyer, 1953), making it difficult to trace the study of this trait through the literature. Hysteranth, succinctly defined as: producing leaves after the flowers have formed, comes from the Greek *husteros* (after) and *anthos* (flower) (Heinig, 1899). The very same phenological pattern can also be described by its linguistic opposite proteranth or protanth, coming from the Greek prefix *pro* (before), defined as: flowering before the foliage leaves appear (Heinig, 1899). Some have attempted to differentiate between hysteranth and proteranth, defining hysteranth more broadly as flowering anytime during the leafless season and ascribing to proteranth a temporal component where flowering occurs seasonally *prior* to budburst (Lamont & Downes, 2011). A third synonym, precocious flowering, comes from the Latin *praecox*, meaning premature (Heinig, 1899). However, precocious flowering is more widely used to describe species or individuals that flower early in their ontogeny (Pharis, Ruddat, Phillips & Heftmann, 1965; Seleznyova, Tustin & Thorp, 2008), and using it to describe leafless flowering produces unnecessary confusion. Additionally, many sources describing hysteranthous flowering do not use any of these terms but rather rely on verbal descriptions of the phenological pattern. We suggest adopting the general term hysteranth, eliminating confusing synonyms and allowing for comparison with other systems in which flowering in the leafless season is common such as the dry deciduous tropics Franklin (2016) and Mediterranean geophyte communities (MARQUES & DRAPER, 2012).

Despite the infrequent and ambiguous descriptions of hysteranth in the literature, several hypotheses for the origins and significance of this phenological trait have emerged. These hypotheses can be broadly classified into two categories: functional and physiological. Functional hypotheses posit that the hysteranthous pattern confers, in and of itself, an adaptive advantage on a species, while physiological hypotheses posit that the hysteranthous pattern emerges due to physiological constraint within a species.

Functional hypotheses

Perhaps the most common explanation for the seemingly high rate of occurrence of hysteranthly in temperate deciduous species is that this phenological pattern is an adaptation critical for wind pollination, with leafless flowering allowing for more efficient pollen dispersal and transfer (Rathcke & Lacey, 1985; Stephen H. Spurr, 1980; Whitehead, 1969). While we are unaware of any studies that have tested this wind pollination efficiency hypotheses directly, there are several studies that provide strong, suggestive support. Simplistically, pollen dispersal can be described a function of the terminal velocity of pollen grains and the wind intensity (Niklas, 1985; Whitehead, 1969). It has been shown that wind velocities in forests are considerably higher in the leafless season than when a canopy is full (Brown, Rodger A.; McVehil, 1969; Whitehead, 1969). and that vegetation structure and canopy closure reduce particle diffusion through a forest (Brown, Rodger A.; McVehil, 1969). These finding indicate that flowering during the leafless period would increase the possibility of long distance pollen dispersal.

Other studies have shown that there is significant filtration of pollen by leaves (MatĀ́sas Milleron, Unai Lopez de Heredia, 2012; Tauber, 1967). A particularly relevant study Tauber 1967, demonstrated high rates of pollen transfer in the trunk space of forest canopies and quantified the amount of pollen impacted on non-floral structures such as branches and leaves. In this study, the author reports pollen counts on a single bare twig, and, on 20 twigs with leaves of a grey willow (*Salix cinerea.*), with 40,000 grains impacted on the bare branch, and 1,687,600 grains on the 20 branches with leaves (Tauber, 1967). Simple arithmetic allows us to estimate that a single branch with leaves would be expected to intercept 84,400 pollen grains, more than double than what was impacted on the bare branch. This finding suggests that flowering during the leafless season significantly reduces the amount of pollen filtration by non-floral plant tissue. Reduced pollen filtration by non-floral structures would decrease the likelihood these taxa would be pollen limited. Pollen limitation has been show to be more common in trees than other plant taxa (LARSON & BARRETT, 2000), but studies of pollen limitation in wind pollinated taxa are limited (Knight *et al.*, 2005). As far back as Darwin, it has been doctrinal that wind pollinated taxa produce an over abundance of pollen (Friedman & Barrett, 2009), but recently, several studies have suggested the pollen and pollen dispersal limitation in wind pollinated taxa may be more prevalent than once thought (Koenig & Ashley, 2003). Research is beginning to address the relationship between phenology, pollen limitation and reproductive output in wind pollinated species (Bogdziewicz, Szymkowiak, Kasprzyk, Grewling, Borowski, Borycka, Kantorowicz, Myszkowska, Piotrowicz, Ziemianin & Pesendorfer, 2017; Koenig, Funk, Kraft, Carmen, Barringer & Knops, 2012; Koenig, Knops, Carmen & Pearse, 2015), but these studies tend to focus on the absolute timing and duration of the flowering season, rather than the timing of flowering relative to leaf phenology. A comparative study of pollen dispersal distances, or the frequency of pollen limitation in hysteranthous and non-hysteranthous taxa would be instructive, but such studies are conceptually challenging because it is difficult to control for

other differences in pollination syndrome between taxa. One possibility would be to utilize the interannual variation in hysteranthy and test whether pollen dispersal distances or the degree pollen limitation change in association with the regular variability in the degree of hysteranthy.

While our discussion of hysteranthy will be primarily focus on the temperate deciduous forests, hysteranthous flowering is also reported to be common in the dry-deciduous tropics (Franklin, 2016; Janzen, 1967). In this system where the vast majority of woody plants species are biotically pollinated, a similar, pollination efficiency hypothesis has emerged, stating that hysteranthous flowering is an adaptation for increased pollinator visibility (Janzen, 1967). To our knowledge there have been no direct test of this hypothesis. One study by Gunatilleke and Gunatilleke 1984 compared the floral of biology of three species of Dogwoods(genus: *Cornus*), and found that the hysteranthous Cornelian cherry (*Cornus mas*) allotted less investment to their floral display and attractant than two other *Cornus* species that flowered with or after leafing out, suggesting increased visibility in the leafless season compensated for this reduced investment. One possible approach to testing the pollination efficiency hypothesis would be to follow this comparative morphology approach for a broader range of hysteranthous and non-hysteranthous species. Another option would be to perform y-maze pollinator choice trials (Giurfa & Vorobyev, 1997) between closely related hysteranthous and non-hysteranthous taxa, or remove the leaves from non-hysteranthous species and compare their visitation rates to unaltered controls.

A third functional hypothesis which we refer to as the "differential selection hypothesis" comes out of an application of life history theory. Phenological plasticity allows organisms to match life cycle events to the appropriate environmental conditions. For species in the temperate zones, the optimal timing for spring phenological events, such as flowering and leafout, is the product of a trade off between seasonal advance to maximize the length of the growing season, and delay to minimize exposure to last season frost events (Kramer, 1995). One possible explanation for hysteranthous flowering patterns is that these selection pressures operate upon foliar and floral phenology with different strength. It has been shown that long lived perennials such as trees and shrubs invest more heavily in growth and survival (foliar resources), rather than reproduction (floral resources) (Franco & Silvertown, 2004). It follows that for such organisms, floral tissues would be more expendable than leaf tissue. Frost damage to developing leaves has been shown to reduce gross primary productive by up 14 percent (Hufkens *et al.*, 2012), while it is unlikely that sporadic pollination droughts from losing a cohort of flowers would make a significant difference in the lifetime fitness of long lived organisms such trees (Knight *et al.*, 2005). This difference in value of these tissues could enable some species to employ a riskier strategy with floral phenology than leaf phenology. For these species, the benefits of early flowering, such as pollination efficiency or increasing fruit development and dispersal time (Primack, 1987), out weigh the risk of late season frost exposure. This is less true for the more critical leaf tissue, and thus a more conservative, delayed phenological strategy is employed (Lenz *et al.*, 2013). This hypothesis posits that it is this differential selection pressure on flower and leaf timing produces the hysteranthous pattern.

For all of these functional hypotheses, species must exhibit physiological independence between flowering and leafing, which is certainly not the case in all temperate woody species, such as species with floral phenologies constrained by the requirement to build flower tissue from the current years photosynthate, or species with flower buds contained within leaf buds. But there is also the possibility that hysteranthly itself is the product of biological constraints.

Physiological hypotheses

The predominant physiological hypothesis suggests that hysteranthous flowering is an adaptive resource partitioning strategy in areas prone to water stress. In such environments, species cannot maintain hydration in their flowers while transpiration is occurring through their leaves, so flowering is temporally allocated to the leafless season. This hypothesis is generally presented as an alternative to the insect visibility hypothesis of the dry tropics (Franklin, 2016). To our knowledge, it has not been widely discussed in the context of temperate forests but may explain hysteranthous flowering in temperate, insect pollinated taxa of more tropical origins.

It is also possible that hysteranthly is a highly conserved trait, and the preponderance of this phenological pattern in the temperate zone is a product of phylogenetic representation of the region rather than an adaptive quality to the trait. In this paper, we explore the phylogenetic signal of hysteranthly in the eastern temperate forests of North America, but more work should be done to understand the distribution and evolutionary history of hysteranthly globally.

None of these hypotheses are necessarily mutually exclusive, it is certainly possible that hysteranthly has arisen multiple times in different selection environments. We should not presume that a single "just so" story could explain the adaptive significance of this complex phenological pattern.

Towards an Empirical Definition of Hysteranthly

Given the lack of explicit research attention in the literature, the most detailed descriptions of hysteranthous flowering come from regional Flora, botanical guidebooks and species monographs. In these sources, hysteranthly information is generally given as verbal description such as "*Flowers: Before the leaves.*" or "*Flowers: When leaves are half grown.*"(?). These kinds of qualitative verbal descriptors are inherently ambiguous and incompatible with our current, more quantitative observation standards such as the BBCH scale (Finn *et al.*, 2007) displayed in the supplement. Does the description "Flowers before leaves" mean that a plant's flower buds burst before the leaf buds? (bbch 55 before 09)? Does it mean that at least one flower is open before the first leaf begins to expand (bbch 60 before 15)? Does it mean peak flowering occurs before most

of a tree's leaves are full size (bbch 65 before 19)? The answer to this question would radically change which species are categorized as hysteranthous. For example, using phenological observations from Harvard Forest from 1990-2015 (O'Keefe, 2015) we see that if our criteria for hysteranthous classification is flower budburst before leaf budburst, only three species in the community could be classified as hysteranthous, while if we use the criteria of flowers open before leaf expansion reaches 75 percent of full size, most of the species community would be considered to be hysteranthous (see figure 1). We suggest that an appropriate empirical definition of hysteranthous is largely dependent on which hypotheses are of interest. For the pollination efficiency hypotheses, we suggest that species that have open flowers during the early part of leaf expansion (bbch 60-65 before 15 or 17) should be considered hysteranthous. If researchers are more interested in the physiological hypotheses developed for the dry tropics, a more conservation definition, flowers between leaf drop and new leaf budburst (bbch 55-65 after and 97 before 09) would be more appropriate. Because the focus of this paper is on temperate forests communities, we have elected to primarily adopt a functional definition of hysteranthous.

Predicting hysteranthous

While direct tests of each of the hysteranthous hypotheses should still be pursued, we can deduce much about the strength of the hypotheses by examining the relationship between hysteranthous and other relevant plant traits. We used published descriptions of hysteranthous species to model the association between hysteranthous and several other biological and phenological traits pertinent to the functional hypotheses of hysteranthous.

For our analysis, we obtained species level descriptions of floral-foliate sequences from the regional guidebook Michigan Trees (Barnes & Wagner, 1981,2004) and its companion volume Michigan Shrubs and Vines (Burton V. Barnes, Christopher W. Dick, 2016), hereafter: MTSV. We investigated several other floras and monographs for inclusion in our analysis, but we found no other with comparably high levels of completeness of phenological descriptions. The complete list of sources we evaluated can be found in the Supplement. While MTSV describes woody plants found in Michigan, these communities bear a strong resemblance to forest communities of the Northeastern United States in generally, and can serve as a reasonable model for the whole region.

We coded hysteranthous as a binary trait based on verbal phenological descriptions. In keeping with our functional definition of hysteranthous, Entries "*flowers: before the leaves*", "*flowers: before or with leaves*" and text "*flowers: with leaves*" were coded as hysteranthous while entries "*flowers with or after leaves*" and "*flowering after leaf development*" were coded as non-hysteranthous. Using the same data source, we obtained descriptions of several other traits that we determined to be biologically relevant to the hysteranthous hypotheses including pollination syndrome, maximum height, shade tolerance, and flowering and fruiting phenology. We coded pollination syndrome as binary trait (wind or animal pollinated). We also condensed

verbal descriptions of shade tolerance to binary, collapsing descriptions "moderately, or medium shade tolerant", "tolerant" and "very tolerant" to "tolerant". In the text, flowering and fruiting phenology are described by a range of months. For both phenological entries, we calculated the average of the time span described, and coded it numerically in our dataset. In total, 194 woody species were included in our analysis.

To investigate the phylogenetic signal of hysteranthly and control for phylogenetic structure in our dataset, we used a published angiosperm phylogenetic tree (Zanne *et al.*, 2013) pruned to match the species list from the MTSV data. Species found in the trait dataset but not in the original phylogenetic tree were added to the pruned tree at the genus level root. In total 32 species were added to the generic roots. To assess the phylogenetic structure in the trait of hysteranthly, we used Caper package (Orme *et al.*, 2013) to calculate a phylogenetic D statistic. To test the hypotheses regarding the trait associations of hysteranthly, we used phylogenetic generalized linear modeling framework (Ives & Garland, 2010) to build a logistical regression model corrected for phylogenetic structure using the R package phylolm (Ho & Ane, 2014). The model was run with 50 bootstrapped re-sampling iterations for each dataset. Continuous predictors were centered and re-scaled by subtracting the mean and dividing by two standard deviations to allow for a reasonable comparison of effect sizes between the binary and continuous predictors in this model (Gelman & Hill, 1997).

To illustrate that our analysis is sensitive to how hysteranthly is defined, we also built a model using a physiological definition of hysteranthly in which only the descriptor "flowers: before leaves" was coded as hysteranthous and all other descriptors were coded as non-hysteranthous. The results from this model can be found in the Supplement.

Our primary analysis suggested that 101 out of 194 species should be classified as hysteranthous (see figure 2). We found that the phylogenetic signal for hysteranthly was low- the D statistic for the trait in the MTSV data was 0.06. Average timing of flowering was the strongest predictor of hysteranthly, with the likelihood of hysteranthly increasing substantially with earlier flowering. Pollination syndrome also had a strong effect, with the likelihood of hysteranthly increasing in wind pollinated taxa (see figure 3). None of the other predictors included in the model has substantial effects.

One challenge to interpreting these results is that since hysteranthous species must flower before their leaves, they can never flower late in the season. This begs the question, do hysteranthous species indeed flower earlier than early flowering non-hysteranthous species? To address this question we re-ran our model on a restricted dataset which only included species that flowered between mid-March and mid-May. We found that even among early flowering species only, the likelihood of hysteranthly still increased substantially with earlier flowering (see figure 3b).

The large effect size of pollination syndrome on the likelihood of hysteranthly gives credence to wind pollination efficiency hypothesis, and supports the long held observation that hysteranthly is associated with this pollination syndrome in the temperate zone. The substantial effect of earlier seasonal flowering on the

likelihood of hysteresis observed in both our full and restricted data set provide support for the differential selection hypothesis in demonstrating that the earliest flowering species are indeed hysteresis. Using average predictive comparisons, we find that with all other traits equal, a species that is wind pollinated is 38 percent more likely to be hysteresis than an insect pollinated species and a species flowering in April is 22 percent more likely to be hysteresis than one flowering in May. These findings suggest that hysteresis is indeed associated with wind pollination and/or extremely early flowering in the temperate deciduous forest of eastern North America.

Hysteresis and Climate Change

The pollination efficiency hypotheses of hysteresis that seems to predominate the literature and find support in our model suggest that the leafless period of flowering is critical for the reproductive success of hysteresis species. With many reported cases of phenological shifts in plants due anthropogenic climate changes, it is certainly possible that hysteresis flowering pattern may be altered by changing seasonal conditions. Any substantial shifts in timing or duration of the hysteresis period could have significant effects on the reproductive success of these species. As stated above, foliar and floral phenology both respond to complex interactions between cold winter vernalization temperatures, warm spring forcing temperatures, and day length. However, we have little understanding of the comparative strength of the cues on different phenophases such as flowering and leafing within one organism. Several studies have found temperature to be the driving phenological cue for leaf out and classify many woody species as "photoperiod insensitive" with regard to their foliar phenology (Basler & Korner, 2012). At the same time, much of the classic work with regards to flowering suggests that the importance of photoperiod (long day/short day) in determining flowering phenology Glover2007. With global climate change, both winter and spring temperature are projected to be warmer on average while photoperiod will remain unchanged. If floral and foliate phenologies respond with proportionate sensitivity to these cues, we may observe overall shifts on phenology but the relative timing between the phenophases would be maintained (figure 3, Scenario 1). However, if flowering and leafing are differentially sensitive to these cues, we would expect that the timing relative to the other many shift. This could result in an extension or contraction (figure 3, Scenario 2a,2b) of the hysteresis period, or even a loss of it entirely (figure 3, Scenario 3). A contraction or loss of the hysteresis period could result increase pollen limitation or restrict pollen dispersal, endangering the long term demographic viability of hysteresis species.

Climate change is also likely to affect the life history trade off inherent to the differential selection hypothesis, which also found support in our analysis. It has been shown that warming spring temperatures tend advance flowering, though this effect may be muted by inverse effect of warmer winters (Cook *et al.*, 2012). Advancing phenology and changing spring climate patterns could push hysteresis flowering deeper into

the unstable climate period of late winter and early spring, and may increase the risk of exposure to late season frost. If the return interval of late season frost damage become more frequent or severe, the reward of early flowering in frost free years may no longer offset the detrimental effects of years with frost episodes. This may give more conservative, later flowering species a demographic advantage over the hysteronthus opportunists.

With the current existing body of research, we cannot assess the likelihood and impact of these scenarios. Given the theorized importance of hysteronthus flowering for the reproductive success of many important temperate forest trees, and the potential for the disruption to this pattern due to global climate change, it is clear that future phenological and climate change research must pay attention to hysteronthus flowering and the inter-phenophase constraints in general. Below, we outline several research directions that should be pursued to better understand the role of this phenological trait.

Future Directions

Patterns of hysteronthus. Because long term data records that report both floral and foliate phenology from the same individuals are relatively rare (Wolkovich & Ettinger, 2014) our analysis relied on verbal descriptions of floral-foliate sequences to classify woody plant species which are by nature imprecise. From such data, we cannot know if differences between descriptions found in separate sources are a reflection of observer bias stemming from authors different metrics for defining hysteronthus (see section II), or reflect true temporal or population differences in degree of hysteronthus. Future phenological observations should make a strong effort incorporate both floral and foliate observations, and hysteronthus should be evaluated as a continuous description rather than a categorical trait. For example, rather than hysteronthus such as "flowers before leaves" in the future, we hope that descriptions could read "over a ten year period, flowers opened on average 12 days before leaves expanded". These more precise descriptions would allow researchers to address many important questions about hysteronthus such as: What is the inter-annual reaction norm of the degree of hysteronthus in individuals? Are there significant population differences in hysteronthus, and do any geographic patterns emerge? Such studies would clarify the extent of the hysteronthus flowering, and may better reveal the selective forces structuring the floral-foliate phenological sequence in woody plants.

Direct tests for functional hypotheses. The results of our study provide suggestive evidence supporting multiple hypothesis regarding the adaptive benefit of hysteronthus flowering. In our discussion of the hypotheses in section 1, we suggested several research approaches that would allow for these hypotheses to be tested more directly. Such explicit tests of these hypotheses should be undertaken by scientists.

Independence and Constraint between phenophases. The looming uncertainty about how global climate change may alter the hysteronthus phenological syndrome is underlain by a more fundamental question: to what degree are floral and foliate phenophases constrained by, or independent of each other? Are

floral and foliate phenological responses differentially sensitive to different environmental cues? Observational studies, correlating variability in hysteranthly with environmental cues, and experimental studies in which cues are directly manipulated would both be useful to address the questions.

Hysteranthly and Masting. It has been well documented that reproduction in long lived organisms is highly variable. Significant inter-annual variation in reproductive investment and output (Bogdziewicz *et al.*, 2017) is well documented in the literature, and this masting is especially prevalent in wind-pollinated taxa (Kelly *et al.*, 2001). How does the variability in hysteranthly interact with this variability in reproductive output? Does the pollination gain suggested in the pollination efficiency hypotheses contribute to mast years? Observational studies should investigate the association between mast years and hysteranthly to help refine our understanding of how phenology may influence this important ecological phenomenon.

Hysteranthly in Other Systems. Our analysis found that hysteranthous flowering is indeed widespread in the temperate forests of the Eastern United States. However, hysteranthly has been reported in other ecosystems, and should be thoroughly investigated in other regions and habitats. In particular, attention should be paid to the dry deciduous forest of Central America where hysteranthly has been reported to be common (Janzen, 1967), but hysteranthly should be explored in other deciduous ecosystems as well.

Summary

Hysteranthly, is an understudied and poorly defined phenological trait that may be critical for the reproductive success of many important woody plant species. In our analysis of 200 woody plant species of the Eastern United States, we found that hysteranthly is common, lacks phylogenetic structure, and is associated with a wind pollination syndrome and extremely early flowering. If hysteranthly is indeed essential for reproductive success of many species, shifted in the hysteranthous period caused by global climate change could have negative impacts on species' fitness, and as such, it is essential that future phenological research investigate this trait more thoroughly.

Figures

References

(1984) Cornus .

Barnes, B.V. & Wagner, W.H.J. (1981,2004) *Michigan Trees: A guide to the Trees of the Great Lakes Region*. University of Michigan Press.

- Basler, D. & Korner, C. (2012) Photoperiod sensitivity of bud burst in 14 temperate forest tree species. *Agricultural and Forest Meteorology* **165**, 73–81.
- Bogdziewicz, M., Szymkowiak, J., Kasprzyk, I., Grewling, L., Borowski, Z., Borycka, K., Kantorowicz, W., Myszkowska, D., Piotrowicz, K., Ziemianin, M. & Pesendorfer, M.B. (2017) Masting in wind-pollinated trees: system-specific roles of weather and pollination dynamics in driving seed production. *Ecology* **98**, 2615–2625.
- Brown, Rodger A.; McVehil, G.E..P.R.L.J..C.R.W. (1969) Characterization of forest vegetation analogs. Tech. rep., Cornell Aeronautical Lab.
- Burton V. Barnes, Christopher W. Dick, M.E.G. (2016) *Michigan Shrubs Vines: A guide to species of the Great Lakes Region*. University of Michigan Press.
- Cook, B.I., Wolkovich, E.M. & Parmesan, C. (2012) Divergent responses to spring and winter warming drive community level flowering trends. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**, 9000–9005.
- Dyer, R.A. (1953) Interpretation of the term hysteranthous **2**, 182–183.
- Finn, G.A., Straszewski, A.E. & Peterson, V. (2007) A general growth stage key for describing trees and woody plants. *Annals of Applied Biology* **151**, 127–131.
- Forrest, J. & Miller-Rushing, A.J. (2010) Toward a synthetic understanding of the role of phenology in ecology and evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **365**, 3101–3112.
- Franco, M. & Silvertown, J. (2004) A comparative demography of plants based upon elasticities of vital rates. *Ecology* **85**, 531–538.
- Franklin, D.C. (2016) Flowering while leafless in the seasonal tropics need not be cued by leaf drop: evidence from the woody genus brachychiton (malvaceae). *Plant Ecology and Evolution* **149**, 272–279.
- Friedman, J. & Barrett, S.C.H. (2009) Wind of change: new insights on the ecology and evolution of pollination and mating in wind-pollinated plants. *Annals of Botany* **103**, 1515–1527.
- Gelman, A. & Hill, J. (2007) *Data Analysis Using Regression and Multilevel/Hierarchical Models*. Cambridge University Press.
- Giurfa, M. & Vorobyev, M. (1997) The detection and recognition of color stimuli by honeybees: Performance and mechanisms. *Israel Journal of Plant Sciences* **45**, 129–140.
- Heinig, R. (1899) Glossary of the botanic terms used in describing flowering plants. Calcutta, India.

- Ho, L.S.T. & Ane, C. (2014) A linear-time algorithm for gaussian and non-gaussian trait evolution models. *Systematic Biology* **63**, 397–408.
- Hoch, G., A., R. & Korner, C. (2003) Non-structural carbon compounds in temperate forest trees. *Plant, Cell Environment* **26**, 1067–1081.
- Hufkens, K., Friedl, M.A., Keenan, T.F., Sonnentag, O., Bailey, A., O’Keefe, J. & Richardson, A.D. (2012) Ecological impacts of a widespread frost event following early spring leaf-out. *Global Change Biology* **18**, 2365–2377.
- Ives, A.R. & Garland, Jr., T. (2010) Phylogenetic logistic regression for binary dependent variables. *Systematic Biology* **59**, 9–26.
- Janzen, D.H. (1967) Synchronization of sexual reproduction of trees within the dry season in central america **21**, 620–637.
- Kelly, D., Hart, D.E. & Allen, R.B. (2001) Evaluating the wind pollination benefits of mast seeding. *Ecology* **82**, 117–126.
- Knight, T.M., Steets, J.A., Vamosi, J.C., Mazer, S.J., Burd, M., Campbell, D.R., Dudash, M.R., Johnston, M.O., Mitchell, R.J. & Ashman, T.L. (2005) Pollen limitation of plant reproduction: Pattern and process. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **36**, 467–497.
- Koenig, W.D. & Ashley, M.V. (2003) Is pollen limited? the answer is blowin’ in the wind. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **18**, 157–159.
- Koenig, W.D., Funk, K.A., Kraft, T.S., Carmen, W.J., Barringer, B.C. & Knops, J.M.H. (2012) Stabilizing selection for within-season flowering phenology confirms pollen limitation in a wind-pollinated tree. *Journal of Ecology* **100**, 758–763.
- Koenig, W.D., Knops, J.M.H., Carmen, W.J. & Pearse, I.S. (2015) What drives masting? the phenological synchrony hypothesis. *Ecology* **96**, 184–192.
- Kramer, K. (1995) Phenotypic plasticity of the phenology of seven european tree species in relation to climatic warming. *Plant, Cell and Environment* **18**, 93–104.
- Lamont, B.B. & Downes, K.S. (2011) Fire-stimulated flowering among resprouters and geophytes in australia and south africa. *Plant Ecology* **212**, 2111–2125.
- LARSON, B.M.H. & BARRETT, S.C.H. (2000) A comparative analysis of pollen limitation in flowering plants. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **69**, 503–520.

- 381 Lechowicz, M.J. (1995) Seasonality of flowering and fruiting in temperate forest trees. *Canadian Journal of*
382 *Botany* **73**, 175–182.
- 383 Lenz, A., Hoch, G., Vitasse, Y. & Körner, C. (2013) European deciduous trees exhibit similar safety margins
384 against damage by spring freeze events along elevational gradients. *New Phytologist* **200**, 1166–1175.
- 385 MARQUES, I. & DRAPER, D. (2012) Decoupling of reproduction and growth: an unusual pattern in the
386 life cycle of the mediterranean geophyte narcissus serotinus. *Plant Species Biology* **27**, 106–109.
- 387 MatĀśas Milleron, Unai Lopez de Heredia, Z.L.R.P.A.D.J.A.L.G.N.N. (2012) Effect of canopy closure on
388 pollen dispersal in a wind-pollinated species (fagus sylvatica l.). *Plant Ecology* **213**, 1715–1728.
- 389 Menzel, A., Sparks, T.H., Estrella, N., Koch, E., AASA, A., AHAS, R., ALM-KÜBLER, K., BISSOLLI,
390 P., BRASLAVSKÁ, O., BRIEDE, A. & et al. (2006) European phenological response to climate change
391 matches the warming pattern. *Global Change Biology* **12**, 1969–1976.
- 392 Niklas, K.J. (1985) The aerodynamics of wind pollination **51**, 328–386.
- 393 O’Keefe, J. (2015) Phenology of woody species at harvard forest since 1990.
- 394 Orme, D., Freckleton, R., Thomas, G., Petzoldt, T., Fritz, S., Isaac, N. & Pearse, W. (2013) *caper: Compar-*
395 *ative Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R*.
- 396 Pfanz, H., A.G.L.H.R.W.C.L.M. (2002) Ecology and ecophysiology of tree stems: corticular and wood pho-
397 tosynthesis. *Naturwissenschaften* **89**, 147–162.
- 398 Pharis, R.P., Ruddat, M.D.E., Phillips, C.C. & Heftmann, E. (1965) Precocious flowering of arizona cypress
399 with gibberellin. *Canadian Journal of Botany* **43**, 923–927.
- 400 Primack, R.B. (1987) Relationships among flowers, fruits, and seeds. *Annual Review of Ecology and System-*
401 *atics* **18**, 409–430.
- 402 Raftery, A.E., Zimmer, A., Frierson, D.M.W., Startz, R. & Liu, P. (2017) Less than 2 °c warming by 2100
403 unlikely. *Nature Climate Change* **7**, 637 EP –.
- 404 Rathcke, B. & Lacey, E.P. (1985) Phenological patterns of terrestrial plants. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
405 *Systematics* **16**, 179–214.
- 406 Robertson, C. (1895) The philosophy of flower seasons, and the phaenological relations of the entomophilous
407 flora and the anthophilous insect fauna **29**, 97–117.
- 408 Schwartz, M.D. (1998) Green-wave phenology. *Nature* **394**, 839 EP –.

- 409 Seleznyova, A.N., Tustin, D.S. & Thorp, T.G. (2008) Apple dwarfing rootstocks and interstocks affect the
 410 type of growth units produced during the annual growth cycle: Precocious transition to flowering affects
 411 the composition and vigour of annual shoots. *Annals of Botany* **101**, 679–687.
- 412 Stephen H. Spurr, B.V.B. (1980) *Forest Ecology*. John Wiley Sons, 3rd edn.
- 413 Tauber, H. (1967) Investigations of the mode of pollen transfer in forested areas. *Review of Palaeobotany and*
 414 *Palynology* **3**, 277–288.
- 415 Whitehead, D.R. (1969) Wind pollination in the angiosperms: Evolutionary and environmental considerations
 416 **23**, 28–35.
- 417 Wolkovich, E.M. & Ettinger, A.K. (2014) Back to the future for plant phenology research. *New Phytologist*
 418 **203**, 1021–1024.
- 419 Zanne, A.E., Tank, D.C., Cornwell, W.K., Eastman, J.M., Smith, S.A., FitzJohn, R.G., McGlinn, D.J.,
 420 O'Meara, B.C., Moles, A.T., Reich, P.B. & et al. (2013) Three keys to the radiation of angiosperms into
 421 freezing environments. *Nature* **506**, 89–92.