

[This document contains the author's accepted manuscript. For the publisher's version, see the link in the header of this document.]

Paper citation: Peterson, A. T., and B. S. Lieberman. 2012. Species' geographic distributions through time: Playing catchup with changing climates. *Evolution: Education and Outreach* (2 March 2012), pp. 1-13, doi:10.1007/s12052-012-0385-2.

Keywords:

Paleontology , Neontology, Geographic distribution, Climate change

Abstract:

Species' ranges are often treated as a rather fixed characteristic, rather than a fluid, ever-changing manifestation of their ecological requirements and dispersal abilities. Paleontologists generally have had a more flexible point of view on this issue than neontologists, but each perspective can improve by appreciating the other. Here, we provide an overview of paleontological and neontological perspectives on species' geographic distributions, focusing on what can be learned about historical variations in distributions. The cross-disciplinary view, we hope, offers some novel perspectives on species-level biogeography.

Text of paper:

Species' Geographic Distributions through Time: Playing Catchup with Changing Climates

A. Townsend Peterson¹ and Bruce S. Lieberman^{1, 2}

¹*Biodiversity Institute and* ²*Department of Geology, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045 USA*

Introduction

Geographic distributions of species are frequently treated as fixed across space, particularly as regards biodiversity conservation efforts (e.g., Collar et al. 1994). The spatial dynamics that lie behind current ranges of species, however, have often gone underappreciated by neontologists, and have been left largely to the consideration of paleontologists (see, e.g., review by Davis and Shaw 2001). Although not without exceptions (see, e.g., the broad body of literature taking advantage of packrat middens; Wells 1983), most of current ecology and evolutionary biology has not pondered the dynamic nature of species' distributions in sufficient detail. This disconnect in point of view has perhaps blinded neontologists to the diversity of geographic and environmental contexts that current species diversity has experienced over its history, and points out an excellent opportunity for

interdigitation between paleontologists and neontologists on several important research questions.

The fields that should be most conscious of these dynamics are molecular systematics and phylogeography. That is, these fields focus attention on population history over geography, as reconstructed by detailed analyses of molecular genetic data. As such, these fields should pay attention more closely to the historical sequence of range dynamics—nonetheless, at least until recently, phylogeography has not taken its 'geography' base seriously enough (Peterson 2009), particularly in light of rampant blind application of molecular clock methodologies to complex geographic and historical questions (Peterson 2007). The result is a field that seriously needs to broaden its vision of the complex set of interactions between history, geography, and environmental conditions, if it is to achieve a truly synthetic perspective.

Paleontologists have traditionally had a much more dynamic view of species' distributions through time and through space (e.g., Coope 1979; Davis 1986; Foster et al. 1990; Lieberman 2000b). Here, given that the paleontological record is by nature a longitudinal view of biological diversity, paleontologists have perforce paid much more attention to the dynamic nature of geographic distributions. Of particular interest, and a phenomenon documented in particularly good detail, are the distributional shifts that accompanied Pleistocene glaciations in many species, some of which are still extant (Martin and Harrell 1957; Lomolino et al. 1989; Roy et al. 1995). The pre-Plio-Pleistocene fossil record does not always display the completeness and density of the youngest geological epochs. Still, similar types of distributional changes have been documented for species in the more distant geological past.

More recently, researchers exploring a novel set of tools have marshalled new sets of information to reflect on these issues, based on the concept of the ecological niche as the suite of environmental conditions within which a species is able to maintain populations without immigrational subsidy (Grinnell 1917, 1924; Soberón and Peterson 2005; Soberón 2007, 2010). Specifically, using ecological niche modeling (ENM) approaches (sometimes mis-termed "species distribution modeling" approaches; Peterson 2006), researchers have established a series of points that have considerable empirical support: (1) that species' ecological niche characteristics are generally conserved over at least moderate periods of evolutionary time (Peterson et al. 1999; Peterson 2011), (2) that species' ecological niches constitute consistent and stable constraints on their distributional potential (Araújo and Rahbek 2006; Araújo et al. 2009), and (3) that dynamics of environments across complex landscapes present significant challenges to species for persistence (Peterson et al. 2002; Pearson and Dawson 2003). With these three insights in hand, numerous research groups have been exploring the possibility of reconstructing paleodistributions of species based on niche model projections over paleoclimate reconstructions (e.g., Martínez-Meyer et al. 2004; Peterson et al. 2004; Bonaccorso et al. 2006; Martínez-Meyer and Peterson 2006; Banks et al. 2007; Peterson and Nyári 2007; Waltari et al. 2007; Banks et al. 2008; Nogués-Bravo et al. 2008; Banks et al. 2009;

Buckley et al. 2009; Jakob et al. 2009; Marske et al. 2009; Shepard and Burbrink 2009; Nyári et al. 2010; Premoli et al. 2010; Varela et al. 2010). Insights from this new field, however, have been limited by the too-frequent lack of fossil material, as well as by “molecular dating” of lineages that frequently leaves much rigor to be desired.

This paper aims to provide an up-to-date overview of the state of knowledge of the dynamics of species' geographic distributions over the past 3-5 million years. That is, we provide a panorama of what is—and is not—known about range shifts from the Pliocene through the Pleistocene and up to the present; special emphasis is paid to terrestrial systems, because ENM approaches to this issue have primarily concentrated there. The aim, most fundamentally, is to set the stage for a broad integration of paleoclimatology, paleontology, and biogeography—more specifically, we hope that this review will further the process of thinking outside of our disciplinary “boxes,” thus leading to better levels of synthesis and integration across fields, especially between paleontology and neontology in general and paleobiogeography and biogeography in particular.

Paleoenvironmental Dynamics

The past several millions of years clearly represents an environmentally distinctive time period. Relative to earth history, this period on average represents an unusually cold interval: indeed, the climatic regime has been broadly characterized as being in an “icehouse” state. Not only were average conditions unusually cold, but also numerous, dramatic, and regular climatic oscillations between warm and cold temperatures, produced by orbitally controlled phenomena termed Milankovitch cycles occurred during this period. For instance, during warm intervals, hippopotami frolicked in the Thames River, and during cold intervals, ice sheets progressed as far south as Kansas. These climatic changes profoundly altered many species' geographic distributions: the aforementioned example involving hippos is just one example; studies that have considered Pleistocene fossils explicitly have focused on beetles (Coope 1979), trees (Davis 1986), and mammals (Graham 1986). Further, migrations associated with changing climates caused changes in population genetic structure, variably through both fragmenting and merging populations, which has been the product of at least three processes: (1) changes in landform (e.g. via uplift or subsidence), (2) climatic changes, and (3) changes in connectivity of coastal areas owing to changing sea levels (which in turn depend in large part on global climate). These regional and global processes are often cited as driving major features of the biodiversity realm (Avice 2000; Lomolino et al. 2005).

Geological processes are generally slow, such that major topographic evolution over the lifespans of most species (10^4 - 10^6 yr, perhaps?) might be seen as fairly unlikely to have influenced major features of species' distributions. However, such changes have been documented to have had significant effects on species' distributions and phylogenetic patterns in the distant geological past, for example, the Cambrian and the Devonian (Lieberman and

Eldredge 1996; Lieberman 2000b, 2003; Meert and Lieberman 2004; Rode and Lieberman 2005). Even since the Late Pleistocene, some Earth regions have shown substantial uplift or subsidence (Harff et al. 2007), and major Earth features, such as the Andean mountain chain, have arisen relatively recently (Hartley 2003), creating important new distributional opportunities and barriers for species and biotas. The relevance of these major changes to the distributional biology of species, of course, depends critically on the age of the species, which depends on the higher taxon and the specific lineage in question.

Certainly of more direct relevance to present-day species' distributional biology has been climate change. The Pleistocene—covering approximately the past 2.5 million years—was characterized by dramatic shifts from conditions rather similar to those of the present day (Otto-Bliesner et al. 2006) to much colder conditions (Dansgaard et al. 1993). The effect of these fluctuations on biodiversity began to be appreciated thanks to the detailed documentation of past vegetation types provided by *Neotoma* packrat middens (Lanner and Van Devender 1981; Wells 1983). Pleistocene climatic shifts also figured very prominently in theories for the diversification of the Amazon Basin (Haffer 1974), and these ideas have been adopted quite broadly (e.g., Church et al. 2003), although they have also been controversial (Bush 1994).

Coastline shifts associated with changing sea levels are another physical environmental dimension that has been cited extensively as structuring distributions of biotas (Heaney 1991). The phenomenon occurs because different global temperature regimes tie up different amounts of water in ice caps and glaciers, meaning that sea level can be quite a bit lower during cold intervals (Lambeck and Chappell 2001)—indeed, Pleistocene glaciations lowered global sea levels by 80-120 m during glacial periods. These rather dramatic changes in sea level left present-day shallow seas as dry land during glacial periods—particularly notable examples from a present-day perspective include the connection of the British Isles to the European mainland, linkage of New Guinea to northern Australia, and connection of the Falkland/Malvinas Islands to the Argentine coast. In deeper time, especially in the Devonian, cycles of sea-level change have been shown to have had profound impacts on biogeographic and phylogenetic patterns (Lieberman and Eldredge 1996; Rode and Lieberman 2005; Abe and Lieberman 2009).

One region where coastline effects associated with Pleistocene sea-level changes have been especially dramatic is in Southeast Asia, in the Sunda Shelf region (Malaysia and Indonesia) and the nearby Philippines. These regions are geographically complex: in some cases, distantly separated islands are separated by continental shelves, whereas closely situated islands may be divided by very deep straits. In this region, broad and relatively shallow seas separating present-day islands became land connections during globally cool periods (Voris 2000). Pleistocene warm-cool cycles then would have produced cycles of connection and isolation, which could have driven speciation pulses—however, although numerous early studies were interpreted as fitting well with this phenomenon (Peterson and Heaney 1993;

Voris 2000; Heaney et al. 2005), more extensive recent studies have found exceptions, suggesting that simple connection or isolation of land masses may not be sufficient to structure biodiversity (Esselstyn and Brown 2009; Esselstyn et al. 2010).

The summary of potential paleoenvironmental dynamics and their effects on species' distributions just presented should serve only to impress the reader of the enormous complexity involved in these processes. Areas suitable for species to inhabit are structured—i.e., connected or isolated—by complex suites of barriers that may be “hard,” such as an ocean for a terrestrial organism, or that may be softer, such as less suitable climatic conditions or less attractive vegetation cover. These barriers are not static, but dynamic, through time, even the “hard” ones—that is, they change in shape and size and effectiveness through time, sometimes over long time periods and sometimes quite abruptly. Finally, different species respond in distinct ways to different types of barriers, such that each lineage may have its own, unique history, or that history may be congruent across several species.

Paleontology and the Past Few Million Years

As already mentioned, during the Pleistocene, globally cool periods (and associated glaciations) and warm interglacial periods alternated, and it might be expected that the species in the extant biota should have been profoundly influenced by these changes. Indeed, either they evolved as part of speciation events that transpired during (and were associated with) the climatic oscillations, or, if they evolved earlier and persisted through this interval of profound change, they should have at least experienced numerous episodes of population aggregation and disassociation in the face of the climatic changes. One real advantage of studying the Pleistocene (and Pliocene), as opposed to earlier time periods, is that we have an exceptionally detailed knowledge of climate during this time interval. This knowledge comes from a variety of sources, including pollen and foram distributional records, and geochemical information collected from sources including pack-rat middens and marine microfossil shells. It has even been possible to reconstruct detailed climate models for these time periods in the marine realm, as with the PRISM (Dowsett et al. 2010) and HadOCC (Collins et al. 2011) initiatives. Further, carbon dating allows us to date Pleistocene climatic events and faunal changes with exceptional precision. Of course, caution must be exercised, especially when the distributional records of still modern species found in the fossil record are used to adduce ancient climate conditions because this process involves uniformitarian assumptions about species' environmental parameters that may not necessarily be valid. However, in light of considerable evidence for conservatism in coarse-resolution ecological niche characteristics of moderate periods of evolutionary time (Peterson 2011), we do not view these issues as being especially problematic. Indeed, they point out the value of the approach being advocated here: using quantitative methods to study the niches of a plethora of species, in a statistical framework, and in the context of detailed climate models.

Information from Molecular Genetics

As should be clear from the preceding section, while paleontological data are the only direct information source about past distributions of species, they will forever be limited by the incomplete nature imposed by the vagaries of preservation. As a consequence, the paleontological record will always be incomplete (just as all sources of scientific information are by their very nature incomplete), and other sources of information must be sought. These sources, while certainly less direct and clear, have the opportunity to provide some insight into past distributional patterns for a broader diversity of species—one important source comes from phylogeographic studies of spatial patterns of molecular genetic differentiation among extant lineages across their geographic distributions (Avice 2000).

A first question that is addressed in phylogeographic studies is the basic existence of population genetic structure across the distribution of a species, which likely reflects past spatial isolation of sub-populations. Some species indeed do not show such structure (Avice 2009), likely as a result of recent origin in a single spatial isolate population. Testing this basic hypothesis offers a first insight regarding past distributions of a given lineage—finding significant population structure leads to a next set of hypothesis tests regarding the nature of that structure (Knowles 2006).

Coalescent approaches offer a next series of inferences regarding the species in question (Knowles 2006). Based on the distribution of alleles of genes among populations of a species and estimates of their origins from single ancestral copies, the statistical properties of the coalescent form the basis of coalescent theory. Coalescent approaches offer the opportunity to reconstruct historical patterns and trends in population size and population subdivision. With advances in the ease with which molecular data can be obtained in quantity (e.g., large population samples, multiple genes, long sequences), this field has become a burgeoning area of inquiry, with hundreds of papers published yearly. The general conclusion—at least for vertebrates and certainly not without exception—has been that, although much of existing genetic structure springs from the Pleistocene, older (pre-Pleistocene) events are discernable as well (e.g., Rodríguez-Sánchez et al. 2010). Earlier and simpler, non-coalescent approaches generally pushed structuring events farther back into the past, antedating the Pleistocene (Klicka and Zink 1997). However, more powerful and refined coalescent-based approaches typically recover the signature of Pleistocene events first and foremost (McCormack et al. 2010). [Further, the beginning of the Pleistocene has recently been extended back nearly a million years (Gradstein et al. 2005; Riccardi 2009), such that some speciation events once defined as *pre*-Pleistocene now need to be re-defined as occurring *within* the Pleistocene.]

These molecular-genetic approaches to understanding historical biogeography, however, are not without limitations. First and most simply, at least the early approaches

employed in phylogeographic studies for estimating splitting times (i.e., dating isolation events) have been overly simple, and without attention paid to variation in evolutionary rates (Peterson 2007). More recent methods incorporate variation among lineages in evolutionary rates (Drummond and Rambaut 2007), but even these dates should nonetheless be considered preliminary and in need of independent confirmation. Of course, it is possible to make phylgeographic inferences without recourse to a molecular clock. For instance, Lieberman (2000a) documented how a freshwater mollusc species had genetic structure signalling Pliocene events, and sought congruence between biogeographic patterns and geological events that could be assigned to specific time intervals.

A more fundamental concern is that phylogeographic approaches have focused largely on the “phylo” part, and less on the “geography” (Peterson 2009). That is, while phylogeographic approaches have much to offer in detecting the *existence* of historical population isolation, they have had less success in associating this isolation with real geographic features of present or past landscapes. This inferential gap has led to subjective “story-telling” when it comes to interpreting the past population isolation in geographic terms, limiting the strength of the inferences about the past geography of species and speciation.

In very recent years, the growing fields of landscape genetics and statistical phylogeography (Holderegger and Wagner 2008) have emerged, presenting considerable promise in filling these gaps, although not without growing pains of understanding appropriate methodologies, and seeking appropriate conceptual frameworks (Wang 2010). In particular, recent efforts to link phylogeographic approaches with geographic inferences derived from ENM hold considerable promise: these advances are treated below, under *Synthesis*.

Niche Modeling Insights

ENM holds great promise for development of spatially-explicit hypotheses on the distributions of species through time. However, this promise is subject to several “caveats,” not the least of which is simply the young and preliminary nature of the field and of its applications to such questions. In this sense, a powerful set of methods is only now being developed, key sets of data are only beginning to be assembled and refined, and analytical and interpretive frameworks are only beginning to be explored.

Caveats.—The basics of ENM approaches are as follows. “Models” are derived from nonrandom associations between known occurrences of species and digital map-based summaries of environmental characteristics, such as maps of climatic parameters. A diversity of algorithms for identifying and quantifying these nonrandom associations has been developed and has seen an unending series of comparative tests (e.g., Elith et al. 2006; Graham et al. 2007; Guisan et al. 2007; Ortega-Huerta and Peterson 2008). Nonetheless, the youth of the field is clear if one considers the heterogeneity of standards, methodologies, and terminologies (Lobo et al. 2008; Peterson et al. 2008; Soberón 2010).

Regarding use of these methodologies to understand present and past distributions of species, numerous assumptions and limitations are clear, as follows. A first, and very important, assumption of these approaches is that ecological niches are conservative enough over time that they can serve as a basis for predictions about the distributional potential of species. This topic, raised in several early papers (Huntley et al. 1989; Ricklefs and Latham 1992; Peterson et al. 1999), has become a topic of considerable debate (Broennimann et al. 2007; Fitzpatrick et al. 2007; Wiens 2008; Medley 2010). However, the debate turns out to be largely a consequence of imprecise definition and consequent misunderstanding of key concepts (e.g., Graham et al. 2004; Fitzpatrick et al. 2008), rather than true conflict of ideas, as has been made clear by recent insights (Warren et al. 2008) and an extensive literature review (Peterson 2011). The emerging view is that ecological niches—at least those defined in terms of the so-called “scenopoetic” variables such as climate—are indeed quite surprisingly stable through at least moderate periods of evolutionary time. Dudei and Stigall (2010), in a fascinating study, considered what happens to the niches of species over longer, geological time scales.

A still-more-fundamental issue is whether species' distributions are structured and constrained by climatic factors, for without this causal association, niche model projections through time and onto different climate scenarios would be rather meaningless. A recent publication (Beale et al. 2008) argued that most of a large sample of bird species across Europe do not have distributions that are constrained by climatic factors. This conclusion, however, was based on analyses fraught with complications (Araújo et al. 2009; Peterson et al. 2009), particularly as regards exclusion of distributional limits of the species in question from the area of analysis. A study developed in parallel to the original one, but in a geographic arena that holds much more species endemism, yielded opposite results (Jiménez-Valverde et al. 2010), suggesting that the original work was flawed, probably in large part owing to artificial delimitation of the study area to western Europe.

Perhaps much more crippling for niche model applications to questions of historical geography of species are concerns about data quality. Despite major community efforts, such as the Paleoclimate Modeling Intercomparison Project (PMIP; <http://pmip.lsce.ipsl.fr/>), terrestrial paleoclimatic data remain rather difficult to come by (at least on global scales), and are presently limited to the Last Glacial Maximum (20,000 yr ago) and the Last Interglacial (135,000 yr ago), which greatly constrains the analyses that can be developed. Hand in hand with this first concern goes the spatial and temporal resolution of those data that are available, which is inevitably coarse. Finally, occurrence data from the present and back through the paleontological record are needed to permit testing and validation of model predictions, but are only partially available and remain incompletely digitally enabled.

Insights.—Several studies have used ENM to study species' biogeography in deep time (e.g., (Stigall Rode and Lieberman 2005; Stigall and Lieberman 2006b; Maguire and Stigall 2009; Dudei and Stigall 2010). For more recent periods, the emerging suite of studies that have

explored paleopredictions of extant species' distributional potential (Martínez-Meyer et al. 2004; Peterson et al. 2004; Bonaccorso et al. 2006; Martínez-Meyer and Peterson 2006; Banks et al. 2007; Peterson and Nyári 2007; Waltari et al. 2007; Banks et al. 2008; Nogués-Bravo et al. 2008; Banks et al. 2009; Buckley et al. 2009; Jakob et al. 2009; Marske et al. 2009; Shepard and Burbrink 2009; Nyári et al. 2010; Premoli et al. 2010; Varela et al. 2010) has begun to perceive some generalities that are quite interesting. For instance, several species in subtropical or temperate regions appear to have had the opportunity to retain much of their present-day distributional area back through globally cold periods like the last glaciation (Peterson et al. 2004; Jakob et al. 2009), such that Pleistocene climate changes may not have caused universal, broad range shifts among huge numbers of species, but rather fluctuations in the relative suitability and continuity of their ranges. As an illustration, Figure 1 provides a view of reconstructed stability among high-latitude *Hordeum* species in South America.

A second insight has been that species' responses to climate change will have greater horizontal manifestations (i.e., range shifts) in different regions. That is, because gradients in environmental characteristics are much broader and shallower in flatland areas than in montane areas, species have to move more broadly to “keep up” with their suitable distributional areas in flatlands than in mountains (Peterson 2003). Figure 2 shows an illustration of these differences in comparisons of birds of the Great Plains and of the adjacent Rocky Mountains. This tendency towards greater range stability in montane regions has interesting implications for generation of diversity, speciation, and other longer-term phenomena.

Finally, these analyses are beginning to cast doubt on some insights from molecular analyses. That is, up to recently, molecular insights, such as dating of speciation events from molecular clock analyses, were the only information available other than what is at times, in the terrestrial realm and for some taxa, a sparse paleontological record. What is more, because molecular clocks are frequently calibrated based on fossil information, insights from these two sources of information are generally non-independent, but give the appearance of independent confirmation. Nonetheless, very preliminary analyses using paleoclimatic projections of niche models are casting doubt on issues that had been “decided” based on molecular data, such as the pre-Pleistocene nature of vertebrate speciation in the Amazon Basin (Bonaccorso et al. 2006; Peterson and Nyári 2007) and the exceptional age of the Sahara Desert as a biogeographic barrier (Nyári et al. 2010). Figure 3 illustrates one such effort to reconstruct historical (Pleistocene Last Glacial Maximum) ranges of species, for *Schiffornis turdinus*, a bird species of the Neotropical lowlands (Peterson and Nyári 2007). Many similar such insights are likely soon to appear on the horizon in the coming years with broader application of these techniques, increasingly in tandem with molecular analyses (Knowles et al. 2007).

Synthesis

The possibilities for a deeper understanding of species' geography back through evolutionary time are quite exciting. Although the field of phylogeography is still rather young (Avice 2000), it stands to benefit massively from incorporation of a much-broader swath of information and evidence (Peterson 2009). Put quite simply, phylogeographic studies in recent years have relied on the potentially rich information available from molecular studies (e.g., dating of splitting events, metrics of population history, etc.), but to the point of not weighting sufficiently other potential sources of insight. The result is a picture of phylogeography that emphasizes the “phylo” much more than the “geography,” and as a consequence we lose some information that could otherwise be of considerable advantage to scientists.

The emerging field of ENM and related approaches brings quantitative, real-world geography to the question of understanding species' geographic distributions. In essence, occurrence data and paleoclimatic estimates that are independent of the molecular and fossil information can be brought to bear on the same questions, which may corroborate previous ideas or may suggest more robust alternatives. For instance, recent molecular studies of the high-latitude barley genus *Hordeum* in South America indicated a refugial historical population structure, in contrast to the “recent expansion” molecular signature that might have been expected in light of postglacial population expansion, an idea that was corroborated by niche model projections that indicated persistence of suitable conditions across the range of the species in question through at least the Late Pleistocene (Jakob et al. 2009). In other cases, the multiple sets of information may contradict one another (e.g., Nyári et al. 2010), prompting reexamination of the strength of evidence behind each viewpoint.

The way forward.—Important steps in the right direction have already been taken, yet challenges remain. First, more powerful approaches are under development that link paleontological evidence with paleoenvironmental data in a niche modeling framework. This advance includes initial explorations (Stigall and Lieberman 2006a; Stigall 2008) that proved concepts. Now, more detailed applications to a variety of paleontological hypotheses are now appearing in the literature (Dudei and Stigall 2010; Myers and Lieberman 2010; Walls and Stigall 2011).

Greater integration between paleontological and neontological information would enrich many studies substantially, although it does face obstacles and in some cases may never be possible. For instance, for some taxa (principally those that are non-skeletonized), reliable paleontological occurrence records may never exist: consider the paucity of fossil information available for any study of worm biogeography. In other groups, even when fossils are known, precise taxonomic assignments may be challenging—such groups may not be the best subjects for biogeographic (and phylogeographic) studies anyway, particularly if the groups under study are ancient (Lieberman 2000b, 2002). The older a group is, the more time is available, offering a greater potential for episodes of range expansion or population extirpation to have occurred. These events might have influenced a group's biogeography and evolution profoundly, but if its

earlier evolutionary history was not appreciated or was unknown to paleontologists, they would be impossible to discern.

Even when we paleontological occurrence records are available, they only define minimum geographic ranges, as the fossil record is unlikely to completely capture the entire geographic range of the species. (Parallel issues also affect neontological occurrence records, but they will generally be much less severe.)

A final issue is that niche modeling studies depend perforce not only on availability of distributional records, but also on linking those records to detailed environmental datasets. For the modern biota, comprehensive environmental datasets exist, comprising diverse variables at fine spatial and temporal resolutions. As we go back in geological time, fewer environmental variables can be sampled, and the precision with which they can be estimated drops rapidly. Temporal precision also lessens dramatically: except in the most pristine paleolacustrine records, indicators of paleoclimate on annual scales is complete folly; instead, we must be content to estimate environmental parameters over broader periods (10^3 - 10^5 yr). We suspect that such limitations are lessened by the longer time intervals under consideration, averaging out the imprecision and assessing larger magnitudes of environmental change. Certainly, including more data (adding fossil information to neontological studies, and data on extant taxa to paleontological studies) always seems like a better path forward: plenty of room exists in studies of biogeography, evolution, and the history of life, to include both paleontology and neontology.

Another important step forward is in the development of methodological frameworks for integrating molecular and niche-based evidence. Papers by Carstens, Richards, and Knowles (Carstens and Richards 2007; Knowles et al. 2007; Richards et al. 2007) presented the basis for new and more synthetic ideas and approaches. This promise is now translating into rich research results, with many exciting and novel papers appearing each month (Chan et al. 2011; Lim et al. 2011). Such rapid methodological evolution suggests a rich future for such studies, in which deep insights into past geographies of species become available.

The big questions.—This overview has emphasized the dynamic nature of the geographic distributions of species. It, nonetheless, remains woefully incomplete, as the answers to many fundamental questions remain largely out of reach. These questions have been the focus of research in biogeography since the origins of the field, and yet have not been answered powerfully. A few of these “big” questions are outlined in the next paragraphs.

The role of Pleistocene climatic fluctuations in generating current biodiversity is poorly understood. Considerable early speculation pointed to a dominant role (Darwin 1859; Haffer 1974), while numerous recent analyses have pointed to a much more minor role (Klicka and Zink 1997). Still, the results of the more recent analyses may not hold up well once better calibrations and molecular dating approaches are used (Peterson 2007). Most recently, several analyses have used more refined approaches to dating speciation events, and have found

indeed that many speciation events do date to the Pleistocene, likely in response to the dramatic climate changes occurring in that period (McCormack et al. 2010). As a consequence, the predominance of Pleistocene speciation remains an open question.

The equilibrium *versus* nonequilibrium nature of species' geographic distributions has not as-yet been established. That is, species' ranges might respond closely to climatic fluctuations, and track appropriate conditions closely, or they might "put up with" the average conditions and "squeak through" the extremes, but the balance is not clear as yet. The question is basically that of whether dispersal abilities of species allow them to track their climatic optima, or whether the rapidity of the climatic changes outstrips species' ability to disperse, colonize, and establish populations, but the answer is not clear. The manner in which climatic changes in the distant geological past triggered invasions, extinctions, and evolution and the relevance of these phenomena to future biotic responses has also not always been considered, though not without positive counterexamples (Vermeij 1978; McGhee Jr. 1996; Rode and Lieberman 2004; Stigall 2010).

Finally, the lessons of the past could have much to teach us about the present and future. Species' responses to current anthropogenic climate changes are only beginning to be appreciated (e.g., Parmesan 1996; Parmesan et al. 1999; Parmesan et al. 2004; Peterson and Martínez-Meyer 2009), and only for a small sample of species for which before-and-after information is available. Looking forward, after early speculation (Peters and Darling 1985; Dobson et al. 1989), model predictions regarding biodiversity in future climate states have often been preliminary and not based on realistic scenarios (e.g., Thomas et al. 2004). More careful scenarios based on linked models of climate change and dispersal are only beginning to appear (Gotelli et al. 2009), leaving much to be understood and discovered.

Literature Cited

- Abe, F. R., and B. S. Lieberman. 2009. The nature of evolutionary radiations: A case study involving Devonian trilobites. *Evolutionary Biology* 36:225-234.
- Araújo, M. B., and C. Rahbek. 2006. How does climate change affect biodiversity? *Science* 313:1396-1397.
- Araújo, M. B., W. Thuiller, and N. G. Yoccoz. 2009. Reopening the climate envelope reveals macroscale associations with climate in European birds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA*.
- Avise, J. C. 2000. *Phylogeography: The History and Formation of Species*, 3rd Ed. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Avise, J. C. 2009. Phylogeography: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Biogeography* 36:3-15.
- Banks, W. E., F. d'Errico, A. T. Peterson, M. Kageyama, and G. Columbeau. 2008. Reconstructing ecological niches and geographic distributions of caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) and red

- deer (*Cervus elaphus*) during the Last Glacial Maximum. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 27:2568-2575.
- Banks, W. E., F. d'Errico, A. T. Peterson, M. Vanhaeren, M. Kageyama, P. Sepulchre, G. Ramstein, A. Jost, and D. Lunt. 2007. Human ecological niches and ranges during the LGM in Europe derived from an application of eco-cultural niche modeling. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 35:481-491.
- Banks, W. E., F. d'Errico, A. T. Peterson, M. Kageyama, A. Sima, and M.-F. Sánchez-Goñi. 2009. Neanderthal extinction by competitive exclusion. *PLoS ONE* 3:e3972.
- Beale, C. M., J. J. Lennon, and A. Gimona. 2008. Opening the climate envelope reveals no macroscale associations with climate in European birds. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 105:14908-14912.
- Bonaccorso, E., I. Koch, and A. T. Peterson. 2006. Pleistocene fragmentation of Amazon species' ranges. *Diversity and Distributions* 12:157-164.
- Broennimann, O., U. A. Treier, H. Müller-Schärer, W. Thuiller, A. T. Peterson, and A. Guisan. 2007. Evidence of climatic niche shift during biological invasion. *Ecology Letters* 10:701-709.
- Buckley, T. R., K. A. Marske, and D. Attanayake. 2009. Identifying glacial refugia in a geographic parthenogen using palaeoclimate modelling and phylogeography: the New Zealand stick insect *Argosarchus horridus* (White). *Molecular Ecology* 18:4650-4663.
- Bush, M. B. 1994. Amazonian speciation: A necessarily complex model. *Journal of Biogeography* 21:5-17.
- Carstens, B. C., and C. L. Richards. 2007. Integrating coalescent and ecological niche modeling in comparative phylogeography. *Evolution* 61:1439-1454.
- Collar, N. J., M. J. Crosby, and A. J. Stattersfield. 1994. *Birds to Watch 2. The World List of Threatened Birds*. BirdLife International, Cambridge, U.K.
- Collins, W. J., N. Bellouin, M. Doutriaux-Boucher, N. Gedney, P. Halloran, T. Hinton, J. Hughes, C. D. Jones, M. Joshi, S. Liddicoat, G. Martin, F. O'Connor, J. Rae, C. Senior, S. Sitch, I. Totterdell, A. Wiltshire, and S. Woodward. 2011. Development and evaluation of an Earth-system model – HadGEM2. *Geoscientific Model Development Discussion* 4:997-1062.
- Coope, G. R. 1979. Late Cenozoic Coleoptera: Evolution, biogeography, and ecology. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 10:247-267.
- Chan, L. M., J. L. Brown, and A. D. Yoder. 2011. Integrating statistical genetic and geospatial methods brings new power to phylogeography. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 59:523-537.
- Church, S. A., J. M. Kraus, J. C. Mitchell, D. R. Church, and D. R. Taylor. 2003. Evidence for multiple Pleistocene refugia in the postglacial expansion of the Eastern Tiger Salamander, *Ambystoma tigrinum tigrinum*. *Evolution* 57:372-383.

- Dansgaard, W., S. J. Johnsen, H. B. Clausen, D. Dahl-Jensen, N. S. Gundestrup, C. U. Hammer, C. S. Hvidberg, J. P. Steffensen, A. E. Sveinbjörnsdóttir, J. Jouzel, and G. C. Bond. 1993. Evidence for general instability of past climate from a 250 kyr ice-core record. *Nature* 264:218-220.
- Darwin, C. 1859. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. John Murray, London.
- Davis, M. B. 1986. Climatic instability, time lags, and community disequilibrium. Pages 269-284 in *Community Ecology* (J. D. a. T. J. Case, Ed.). Harper and Row, New York.
- Davis, M. B., and R. G. Shaw. 2001. Range shifts and adaptive responses to Quaternary climate change. *Science* 292:673-679.
- Dobson, A., A. Jolly, and D. Rubenstein. 1989. The Greenhouse Effect and biological diversity. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 4:64-68.
- Dowsett, H. J., M. Robinson, A. Hayward, U. Salzmann, D. Hill, L. Sohl, M. Chandler, M. Williams, K. Foley, and D. Stoll. 2010. The PRISM3D paleoenvironmental reconstruction. *Stratigraphy* 7:123-140.
- Drummond, A., and A. Rambaut. 2007. BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by sampling trees. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 7:214.
- Dudei, N. L., and A. L. Stigall. 2010. Using ecological niche modeling to assess biogeographic and niche response of brachiopod species to the Richmondian Invasion (Late Ordovician) in the Cincinnati Arch. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 296:28-43.
- Elith, J., C. H. Graham, R. P. Anderson, M. Dudik, S. Ferrier, A. Guisan, R. J. Hijmans, F. Huettman, J. R. Leathwick, A. Lehmann, J. Li, L. G. Lohmann, B. A. Loiselle, G. Manion, C. Moritz, M. Nakamura, Y. Nakazawa, J. M. Overton, A. T. Peterson, S. J. Phillips, K. Richardson, R. Scachetti-Pereira, R. E. Schapire, J. Soberón, S. E. Williams, M. S. Wisz, and N. E. Zimmermann. 2006. Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography* 29:129-151.
- Esselstyn, J. A., and R. M. Brown. 2009. The role of repeated sea-level fluctuations in the generation of shrew (Soricidae: *Crociodura*) diversity in the Philippine Archipelago. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 53:171-181.
- Esselstyn, J. A., C. H. Oliveros, R. G. Moyle, A. T. Peterson, J. A. McGuire, and R. M. Brown. 2010. Evolutionary complexity and taxonomic bias at a biogeographic crossroads: Phylogenetic evidence erodes support for Huxley's Line. *Journal of Biogeography* 37:2054-2066.
- Fitzpatrick, M. C., R. R. Dunn, and N. J. Sanders. 2008. Datasets matter, but so do evolution and ecology: A response to Peterson and Nakazawa. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17:562-565.

- Fitzpatrick, M. C., J. F. Weltzin, N. J. Sanders, and R. R. Dunn. 2007. The biogeography of prediction error: Why does the introduced range of the fire ant over-predict its native range? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 16:24-33.
- Foster, D. R., P. K. Schoonmaker, and S. T. A. Pickett. 1990. Insights from paleoecology to community ecology. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 5:119-122.
- Gotelli, N. J., M. J. Anderson, H. T. Arita, A. Chao, R. K. Colwell, S. R. Connolly, D. J. Currie, R. R. Dunn, G. R. Graves, J. L. Green, J.-A. Grytnes, Y.-H. Jiang, W. Jetz, S. Kathleen Lyons, C. M. McCain, A. E. Magurran, C. Rahbek, T. F. L. V. B. Rangel, J. Soberón, C. O. Webb, and M. R. Willig. 2009. Patterns and causes of species richness: a general simulation model for macroecology. *Ecology Letters* 12:873-886.
- Gradstein, F. M., J. G. Ogg, and A. G. Smith, Eds. 2005. *A Geologic Time Scale 2004*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Graham, C. H., J. Elith, R. Hijmans, A. Guisan, A. T. Peterson, B. A. Loiselle, and NCEAS Species Distribution Modeling Group. 2007. The influence of spatial errors in species occurrence data used in distribution models. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 45:239-247.
- Graham, C. H., S. R. Ron, J. C. Santos, C. J. Schneider, and C. Moritz. 2004. Integrating phylogenetics and environmental niche models to explore speciation mechanisms in dendrobatid frogs. *Evolution* 58:1781-1793.
- Graham, R. W. 1986. Response of mammalian communities to environmental changes during the late Quaternary. Pages 300-313 in *Community Ecology* (J. Diamond, and T. J. Case, Eds.). Harper and Row, New York.
- Grinnell, J. 1917. Field tests of theories concerning distributional control. *American Naturalist* 51:115-128.
- Grinnell, J. 1924. Geography and evolution. *Ecology* 5:225-229.
- Guisan, A., C. H. Graham, J. Elith, F. Huettman, and NCEAS Species Distribution Modelling Group. 2007. Sensitivity of predictive species distribution models to change in grain size. *Diversity and Distributions* 13:332-340.
- Haffer, J. 1974. Avian speciation in tropical South America, with a systematic survey of the toucans (Ramphastidae) and jacamars (Galbulidae). *Publications of the Nuttall Ornithology Club* 14:1-390.
- Harff, J., W. W. Hay, and D. M. Tetzlaff, Eds. 2007. *Coastline Changes: Interrelation of Climate and Geological Processes*. Geological Society of America, Boulder, Colorado.
- Hartley, A. J. 2003. Andean uplift and climate change. *Journal of the Geological Society* 160:7-10.
- Heaney, L. R. 1991. A synopsis of climatic and vegetational change in Southeast Asia. *Climatic Change* 19:53-61.

- Heaney, L. R., J. S. Walsh Jr., and A. T. Peterson. 2005. The roles of geological history and colonization abilities in genetic differentiation between mammalian populations in the Philippine archipelago. *Journal of Biogeography* 32:229-247.
- Holderegger, R., and H. H. Wagner. 2008. Landscape genetics. *BioScience* 58:199-207.
- Huntley, B., P. J. Bartlein, and I. C. Prentice. 1989. Climatic control of the distribution and abundance of beech (*Fagus* L.) in Europe and North America. *Journal of Biogeography* 16:551-560.
- Jakob, S. S., E. Martinez-Meyer, and F. R. Blattner. 2009. Phylogeographic analyses and paleodistribution modeling indicate Pleistocene *in situ* survival of *Hordeum* species (Poaceae) in southern Patagonia without genetic or spatial restriction. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 26:907-923.
- Jiménez-Valverde, A., N. Barve, A. Lira-Noriega, S. P. Maher, Y. Nakazawa, M. Papeş, J. Soberón, J. Sukumaran, and A. T. Peterson. 2010. Dominant climate influences on North American bird distributions. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 20:114-118.
- Klicka, J., and R. M. Zink. 1997. The importance of recent ice ages in speciation: A failed paradigm. *Science* 277:1666-1669.
- Knowles, L. L. 2006. Statistical phylogeography. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 40:593-612.
- Knowles, L. L., B. C. Carstens, and M. L. Keat. 2007. Coupling genetic and ecological-niche models to examine how past population distributions contribute to divergence. *Current Biology* 17:940-946.
- Lambeck, K., and J. Chappell. 2001. Sea level change through the last glacial cycle. *Science* 292:679-686.
- Lanner, R. M., and T. R. Van Devender. 1981. Late Pleistocene piñon pines in the Chihuahuan Desert. *Quaternary Research* 15:278-290.
- Lieberman, B. S. 2000a. Applying molecular phylogeography to test paleoecological hypotheses: a case study involving *Amblema plicata* (Mollusca, Unionidae). Pages 83-103 in *Evolutionary Paleoecology* (W. D. Allmon, and D. Bottjer, Eds.). Columbia University Press, New York.
- Lieberman, B. S. 2000b. *Paleobiogeography: Using Fossils to Study Global Change, Plate Tectonics, and Evolution*. Plenum Press/Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York.
- Lieberman, B. S. 2002. Biogeography with and without the fossil record. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 178:39-52.
- Lieberman, B. S. 2003. Paleobiogeography: The relevance of fossils to biogeography. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 34:51-69.
- Lieberman, B. S., and N. Eldredge. 1996. Trilobite biogeography in the Middle Devonian: Geological processes and analytical methods. *Paleobiology* 22:66-79.

- Lim, H. C., M. A. Rahman, S. L. H. Lim, R. G. Moyle, and F. H. Sheldon. 2011. Revisiting Wallace's haunt: Coalescent simulations and comparative niche modeling reveal historical mechanisms that promoted avian population divergence in the Malay Archipelago. *Evolution* 65:321-334.
- Lobo, J. M., A. Jiménez-Valverde, and R. Real. 2008. AUC: A misleading measure of the performance of predictive distribution models. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 17:145-151.
- Lomolino, M. V., J. H. Brown, and R. Davis. 1989. Island biogeography of montane forest mammals in the American Southwest. *Ecology* 70:180-194.
- Lomolino, M. V., B. R. Riddle, and J. H. Brown. 2005. *Biogeography*, 3rd edn. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland.
- Maguire, K. C., and A. L. Stigall. 2009. Distribution of fossil horses in the Great Plains during the Miocene and Pliocene: An ecological niche modeling approach. *Paleobiology* 35:597-611.
- Marske, K. A., R. A. B. Leschen, G. M. Barker, and T. R. Buckley. 2009. Phylogeography and ecological niche modelling implicate coastal refugia and trans-alpine dispersal of a New Zealand fungus beetle. *Molecular Ecology* 18:5126-5142.
- Martin, P. S., and B. E. Harrell. 1957. The Pleistocene history of temperate biotas in Mexico and eastern United States. *Ecology* 38:468-480.
- Martínez-Meyer, E., and A. T. Peterson. 2006. Conservatism of ecological niche characteristics in North American plant species over the Pleistocene-to-Recent transition. *Journal of Biogeography* 33:1779-1789.
- Martínez-Meyer, E., A. T. Peterson, and W. W. Hargrove. 2004. Ecological niches as stable distributional constraints on mammal species, with implications for Pleistocene extinctions and climate change projections for biodiversity. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 13:305-314.
- McCormack, J. E., K. S. Delaney, and A. T. Peterson. 2010. Calibrating divergence times on species trees versus gene trees: Implications for speciation history of *Aphelocoma* jays. *Evolution* DOI: 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2010.01097.x.
- McGhee Jr., G. R. 1996. *The Late Devonian Mass Extinction*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Medley, K. A. 2010. Niche shifts during the global invasion of the Asian tiger mosquito, *Aedes albopictus* Skuse (Culicidae), revealed by reciprocal distribution models. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19:122-133.
- Meert, J. G., and B. S. Lieberman. 2004. A palaeomagnetic and palaeobiogeographic perspective on latest Neoproterozoic and early Cambrian tectonic events. *Journal of the Geological Society of London* 161:1-11.

- Myers, C. E., and B. S. Lieberman. 2010. Sharks that pass in the night: Using geographical information systems to investigate competition in the Cretaceous Western Interior Seaway. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* in press.
- Nogués-Bravo, D., J. Rodríguez, J. Hortal, P. Batra, and M. B. Araújo. 2008. Climate change, humans, and the extinction of the Woolly Mammoth. *PLoS Biology* 6:e79.
- Nyári, Á. S., A. T. Peterson, and G. B. Rathbun. 2010. Late Pleistocene potential distribution of the North African elephant-shrew *Elephantulus rozeti* (Mammalia: Macroscelidea). *African Zoology* 45:330-339.
- Ortega-Huerta, M. A., and A. T. Peterson. 2008. Modeling ecological niches and predicting geographic distributions: A test of six presence-only methods. *Revista Mexicana de la Biodiversidad* 79:205-216.
- Otto-Bliesner, B. L., S. J. Marshall, J. T. Overpeck, G. H. Miller, A. Hu, and CAPE Last Interglacial Project members. 2006. Simulating Arctic climate warmth and icefield retreat in the Last Interglaciation. *Science* 311:1751-1753.
- Parmesan, C. 1996. Climate and species' range. *Nature* 382:765-766.
- Parmesan, C., S. Gaines, L. González, D. M. Kaufman, J. Kingsolver, A. T. Peterson, and R. Sagarin. 2004. Empirical perspectives on species borders: From traditional biogeography to global change. *Oikos* 108:58-75.
- Parmesan, C., N. Ryrholm, C. Stefanescu, J. K. Hill, C. D. Thomas, H. Descimon, B. Huntley, L. Kaila, J. Kullberg, T. Tammaru, J. Tennent, J. A. Thomas, and M. Warren. 1999. Poleward shift of butterfly species' ranges associated with regional warming. *Nature* 399:579-583.
- Pearson, R. G., and T. P. Dawson. 2003. Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: Are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 12:361-371.
- Peters, R. L., and J. D. S. Darling. 1985. The Greenhouse Effect and nature reserves. *BioScience* 35:707-717.
- Peterson, A. T. 2003. Projected climate change effects on Rocky Mountain and Great Plains birds: Generalities of biodiversity consequences. *Global Change Biology* 9:647-655.
- Peterson, A. T. 2006. Uses and requirements of ecological niche models and related distributional models. *Biodiversity Informatics* 3:59-72.
- Peterson, A. T. 2007. Application of molecular clocks in ornithology revisited. *Journal of Avian Biology* 37:541-544.
- Peterson, A. T. 2009. Phylogeography is not enough: The need for multiple lines of evidence. *Frontiers in Biogeography* 1:19-25.
- Peterson, A. T. 2011. Ecological niche conservatism: A time-structured review of evidence. *Journal of Biogeography* 38:817-827.

- Peterson, A. T., N. Barve, L. M. Bini, J. A. Diniz-Filho, A. Jiménez-Valverde, A. Lira-Noriega, J. M. Lobo, S. Maher, P. d. Marco Júnior, E. Martínez-Meyer, Y. Nakazawa, and J. Soberón. 2009. The climate envelope may not be empty. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 106:E47.
- Peterson, A. T., and L. R. Heaney. 1993. Genetic differentiation in Philippine bats of the genera *Cynopterus* and *Haplonycteris*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 49:203-218.
- Peterson, A. T., and E. Martínez-Meyer. 2009. Pervasive poleward shifts among North American bird species. *Biodiversity* 9:14-16.
- Peterson, A. T., E. Martínez-Meyer, and C. González-Salazar. 2004. Reconstructing the Pleistocene geography of the *Aphelocoma* jays (Corvidae). *Diversity and Distributions* 10:237-246.
- Peterson, A. T., and Á. Nyári. 2007. Ecological niche conservatism and Pleistocene refugia in the Thrush-like Mourner, *Schiffornis* sp., in the Neotropics. *Evolution* 62-1:173-183.
- Peterson, A. T., M. A. Ortega-Huerta, J. Bartley, V. Sanchez-Cordero, J. Soberon, R. H. Buddemeier, and D. R. B. Stockwell. 2002. Future projections for Mexican faunas under global climate change scenarios. *Nature* 416:626 - 629.
- Peterson, A. T., M. Papeş, and J. Soberón. 2008. Rethinking receiver operating characteristic analysis applications in ecological niche modelling. *Ecological Modelling* 213:63-72.
- Peterson, A. T., J. Soberón, and V. Sánchez-Cordero. 1999. Conservatism of ecological niches in evolutionary time. *Science* 285:1265-1267.
- Premoli, A. C., P. Mathiasen, and T. Kitzberger. 2010. Southern-most *Nothofagus* trees enduring ice ages: Genetic evidence and ecological niche retrodiction reveal high latitude (54°S) glacial refugia. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 298:247-256.
- Riccardi, A. C. 2009. IUGS ratified ICS recommendation on redefinition of Pleistocene and formal definition of base of Quaternary [resolution]. *International Union of Geological Sciences*.
- Ricklefs, R. E., and R. E. Latham. 1992. Intercontinental correlation of geographical ranges suggests stasis in ecological traits of relict genera of temperate perennial herbs. *American Naturalist* 139:1305-1321.
- Richards, C. L., B. C. Carstens, and L. L. Knowles. 2007. Distribution modelling and statistical phylogeography: An integrative framework for generating and testing alternative biogeographical hypotheses. *Journal of Biogeography* 34:1833-1845.
- Rode, A., and B. S. Lieberman. 2004. Using GIS to study the biogeography of the Late Devonian biodiversity crisis. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 211:345-359.
- Rode, A. L., and B. S. Lieberman. 2005. Integrating biogeography and evolution using phylogenetics and PaleoGIS: A case study involving Devonian crustaceans. *Journal of Paleontology* 79:267-276.

- Rodríguez-Sánchez, F., A. Hampe, P. Jordano, and J. Arroyo. 2010. Past tree range dynamics in the Iberian Peninsula inferred through phylogeography and palaeodistribution modelling: A review. *Review of Palaeobotany and Palynology* 162:507-521.
- Roy, K., D. Jablonsk, and J. W. Valentine. 1995. Thermally anomalous assemblages revisited: Patterns in the extraprovincial latitudinal range shifts of Pleistocene marine mollusks. *Geology* 23:1071-1074.
- Shepard, D. B., and F. T. Burbrink. 2009. Phylogeographic and demographic effects of Pleistocene climatic fluctuations in a montane salamander, *Plethodon fourchensis*. *Molecular Ecology* 18:2243-2262.
- Soberón, J. 2007. Grinnellian and Eltonian niches and geographic distributions of species. *Ecology Letters* 10:1115-1123.
- Soberón, J. 2010. Niche and area of distribution modeling: A population ecology perspective. *Ecography* 33:159-167.
- Soberón, J., and A. T. Peterson. 2005. Interpretation of models of fundamental ecological niches and species' distributional areas. *Biodiversity Informatics* 2:1-10.
- Stigall, A. L. 2008. Tracking species in space and time: Assessing the relationships between paleobiogeography, paleoecology, and macroevolution. Pages 227-242 in *From Evolution to Geobiology: Research Questions Driving Paleontology at the Start of a New Century* (P. H. Kelley, and R. K. Bambach, Eds.). Paleontological Society, Boulder, Colorado.
- Stigall, A. L. 2010. Invasive species and biodiversity crises: Testing the link in the Late Devonian. *PLoS ONE* 5:e15584.
- Stigall, A. L., and B. S. Lieberman. 2006a. Quantitative palaeobiogeography: GIS, phylogenetic biogeographical analysis, and conservation insights. *Journal of Biogeography* 33:2051-2060.
- Stigall, A. L., and B. S. Lieberman. 2006b. Quantitative paleobiogeography: GIS, phylogenetic biogeographic analysis, and conservation insights. *Journal of Biogeography* 33:2051-2060.
- Stigall Rode, A. L., and B. S. Lieberman. 2005. Using environmental niche modelling to study the Late Devonian biodiversity crisis. Pages 93-180 in *Understanding Late Devonian and Permian-Triassic Biotic and Climatic Events: Towards an Integrated Approach. Developments in Palaeontology and Stratigraphy* (D. J. Over, J. R. Morrow, and P. B. Wignall, Eds.). Elsevier, Amsterdam.
- Thomas, C. D., A. Cameron, R. E. Green, M. Bakkenes, L. J. Beaumont, Y. C. Collingham, B. F. N. Erasmus, M. Ferreira de Siqueira, A. Grainger, L. Hannah, L. Hughes, B. Huntley, A. S. Van Jaarsveld, G. E. Midgely, L. Miles, M. A. Ortega-Huerta, A. T. Peterson, O. L. Phillips, and S. E. Williams. 2004. Extinction risk from climate change. *Nature* 427:145-148.

Peterson, A. T., and B. S. Lieberman. 2012. Species' geographic distributions through time: Playing catchup with changing climates. *Evolution: Education and Outreach* (2 March 2012), pp. 1-13, Publisher's official version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12052-012-0385-2> . Open Access version: <http://kuscholarworks.ku.edu/dspace/>.

Varela, S., J. M. Lobo, J. Rodríguez, and P. Batra. 2010. Were the Late Pleistocene climatic changes responsible for the disappearance of the European spotted hyena populations? Hindcasting a species geographic distribution across time. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 29:2027-2035.

Vermeij, G. 1978. *Biogeography and Adaptation*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Voris, H. K. 2000. Maps of Pleistocene sea levels in Southeast Asia: Shorelines, river systems and time durations. *Journal of Biogeography* 27:1153-1167.

Waltari, E., S. Perkins, R. Hijmans, A. T. Peterson, Á. Nyári, and R. Guralnick. 2007. Locating Pleistocene refugia: Comparing phylogeographic and ecological niche model predictions. *PLoS ONE* 2:e563.

Walls, B. J., and A. L. Stigall. 2011. Analyzing niche stability and biogeography of Late Ordovician brachiopod species using ecological niche modeling. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 299:15-29.

Wang, I. J. 2010. Recognizing the temporal distinctions between landscape genetics and phylogeography. *Molecular Ecology* 19:2605-2608.

Warren, D. L., R. E. Glor, and M. Turelli. 2008. Environmental niche equivalency versus conservatism: Quantitative approaches to niche evolution. *Evolution* 62:2868-2883.

Wells, P. V. 1983. Paleobiogeography of montane islands in the Great Basin since the last glaciopluvial. *Ecological Monographs* 53:341-382.

Wiens, J. J. 2008. Commentary on Losos (2008): Niche conservatism déjà vu. *Ecology Letters* 11:1004-1005.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Present-day (dark gray and black) and past (light gray and black) distribution models of three *Hordeum* species in southern South America, calculated with GARP on the basis of present-day occurrence points (white dots) for the species. The past potential distribution areas are during the Last Glacial Maximum (about 21,000 years ago) represent a consensus between two different global climate models. Apart from inland Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego, the models infer stable potential distributional areas of the *Hordeum* species throughout their present-day distributions since the Last Glacial Maximum. Reproduced with permission from Jakob et al. (2009).

Figure 2. Projected change in potential distributional areas (left column, expressed as percent of present distributional area), and projected distance that range centroids would shift, as a result of modeled climate change processes. Results are separated for montane (black) and flatlands (white) species, and for three assumptions regarding dispersal ability (no dispersal, contiguous dispersal, universal dispersal). Note the contrasts between montane and flatlands species in the degree of change of suitable area and position of suitable areas. Reproduced with permission from Peterson (2003).

Figure 3. Ecological niche model estimates of present-day and Last Glacial Maximum potential distributional areas, the latter under two different general circulation model estimates, for *Schiffornis turdinus*. Also shown are sample points for niche model development (Xs), and sampling localities for genetic data (squares, with different colors indicating distinct molecular phylogroups). Reproduced with permission from Peterson and Nyári (2007).




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3