

PROGNATHISM: FROM RACIAL PREJUDICE TO EVOLUTIONARY AND CLINICAL UNDERSTANDING

Grigorescu Cătălin Cicerone¹, Tihan Eusebiu Jean², Forna Norina Consuela³,
Grigorescu Șerban Maxim^{4*}

¹ Vasile Goldis Western University of Arad

² Tihan and Associates. Professional civil society for psychology

⁴ Victor Babes University of Medicine and Pharmacy, Timisoara

Corresponding author: Grigorescu Șerban Maxim

Forna Norina Consuela e-mail: profforna@gmail.com

Abstract

Prognathism, a pronounced protrusion of the mandible or maxilla, has had a winding semantic path: from a supposed "racial marker" of "primitivism" in 19th-century anthropology, to a normal phenotypic variation within the human species, and finally to a medical condition with specific functional implications. This article deconstructs this conceptual evolution. By integrating medical, evolutionary, and biocultural perspectives, we argue that differences in the degree of prognathism primarily reflect adaptations to diet and population history, varying continuously without delimiting discrete human groups. A meta-analysis of recent literature confirms the scientific consensus that rejects any racial taxonomy based on this trait, reframing it as a subject of interest for orthodontics, orthognathic surgery, and evolutionary anthropology.

Keywords: Mandibular prognathism, Class III malocclusion, Dietary adaptation, Clinal variation, and Orthognathic surgery

Introduction: A Jaw in the Face of History

Prognathism (from the Greek *pro*, meaning "before," and *gnathos*, meaning "jaw") refers to the anterior protrusion of one of the jaws relative to the cranial base. In contemporary orthodontics and maxillofacial medicine, prognathism is primarily conceptualized as a skeletal discrepancy, most commonly corresponding to Angle Class III malocclusion. From a clinical standpoint, it is associated with functional challenges such as impaired mastication, altered speech, compromised airway dynamics, and significant aesthetic concerns, often requiring complex orthodontic, orthopedic, or surgical interventions[1,2].

Yet, prognathism cannot be fully understood through a purely clinical lens. Beyond its role as a craniofacial diagnosis,

it occupies a uniquely charged position at the intersection of biology, history, and ideology. Like other cranial traits—most notably the cephalic index—prognathism has carried meanings far exceeding its anatomical significance. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, it was appropriated by the emerging frameworks of scientific racism and physical anthropology, where it was reinterpreted as a visible marker of evolutionary inferiority, moral deficiency, or intellectual limitation. In this context, jaw projection was no longer viewed as a variation of human morphology, but as an alleged biological signal of primitiveness, frequently mapped onto racialized and colonial hierarchies[3,4].

This historical burden transformed prognathism into a pseudo-objective instrument of human classification. Craniofacial morphology was stripped of

its developmental and environmental context and instead treated as a fixed, inherited trait with deterministic implications. Such interpretations ignored the complexity of craniofacial growth, the role of genetic polygenicity, and the profound influence of functional matrices, environmental pressures, and cultural practices. As with the cephalic index, numerical or visual descriptors of jaw projection were granted unwarranted epistemic authority, allowing social prejudice to masquerade as biological fact[5].

Modern science has decisively challenged these assumptions. Advances in developmental biology, population genetics, evolutionary anthropology, and neuroscience have demonstrated that prognathism represents a spectrum of continuous variation rather than a categorical abnormality or ancestral remnant. Jaw morphology reflects a dynamic interplay of genetic predisposition, epigenetic regulation, biomechanical forces, and environmental influences such as diet, respiratory patterns, and growth timing. From an evolutionary perspective, variation in jaw projection has been shaped by adaptive responses to changing ecological and functional demands, not by linear hierarchies of human worth[6,7].

At the same time, a critical re-examination of the historical uses of prognathism is essential. Understanding how a clinical trait was transformed into an ideological symbol reveals broader patterns in the history of science—namely, how anatomical features can be weaponized when measurement is divorced from context and ethics. Prognathism thus serves as a paradigmatic example of how biological variation can be misinterpreted when scientific inquiry is guided by essentialism rather than by developmental and population-based thinking[8,9].

Accordingly, a contemporary understanding of prognathism demands a multi-pronged approach. A **biological perspective** is required to elucidate its etiological mechanisms and clinical implications; an **evolutionary perspective** is necessary to situate jaw variation within the broader framework of human diversity; and a **critical historical perspective** is indispensable for deconstructing the ideological legacy that continues to influence both scientific discourse and social perception[Fig.1]. Only through such an integrated framework can prognathism be reclaimed as what it truly is: not a marker of hierarchy or deficiency, but a legitimate expression of human craniofacial variability.



Figure1 . Mandibular prognathism in members of the Habsburg dynasty, historically associated with dynastic inbreeding and complex genetic inheritance patterns.
(After Álvarez et al., 2009)

1. Medical Perspective: Multifactorial Etiology and Clinical Approach

From a strictly medical perspective, prognathism is understood as a craniofacial skeletal discrepancy whose relevance is defined by its impact on function and health. In orthodontics and maxillofacial medicine, it is not interpreted as a deviation from a normative facial ideal, but as a structural variation that becomes clinically relevant only when it interferes with essential oral, respiratory, or stomatognathic functions. This functional framing clearly separates medical evaluation from historical or aesthetic judgments[10].

Clinically, prognathism encompasses several skeletal patterns. These include **mandibular prognathism**, characterized by excessive anterior mandibular growth; **maxillary retrognathism**, involving insufficient forward development of the maxilla; and **combined forms**, in which both jaws contribute to a Class III skeletal relationship. Importantly, these phenotypes represent different developmental pathways rather than discrete diseases. Prognathism therefore reflects a **multifactorial etiology**, arising from the interaction of genetic predisposition, environmental influences, and systemic factors acting throughout growth[11].

Genetic factors play a central role in this process. Craniofacial growth is governed by complex, polygenic inheritance, and epidemiological studies consistently report a higher prevalence of skeletal Class III patterns in certain populations, particularly in East Asia. This observation supports a strong genetic contribution while simultaneously underscoring the absence of simple, deterministic inheritance models.

Genetic susceptibility defines a developmental potential rather than a fixed outcome[12].

Environmental and functional influences further modulate craniofacial development. Chronic mouth breathing, altered tongue posture, and parafunctional habits such as thumb sucking can exacerbate or reveal an underlying skeletal tendency by altering muscular forces and growth vectors. In addition, prognathism may occur secondarily in systemic conditions such as acromegaly, or as part of complex craniofacial syndromes, including Crouzon and Apert syndromes, where abnormal growth patterns are driven by broader developmental disturbances[13].

Medical intervention is therefore guided by **functional necessity rather than aesthetic convention**. Prognathism becomes clinically significant when it produces masticatory inefficiency, speech disturbances, periodontal overload due to malocclusion, or upper airway compromise, including obstructive sleep apnea. In such cases, treatment typically requires an interdisciplinary approach, combining orthodontic therapy with orthognathic surgery to restore functional balance, skeletal harmony, and long-term stability[14].

2. Evolutionary and Biocultural Perspective: Diet, Environment, and Continuous Variation

While medicine focuses on individual function, physical anthropology situates prognathism within the broader framework of human evolutionary history. From this perspective, global variation in jaw projection is interpreted not through racial typologies, but as the outcome of long-term

ecological, functional, and biocultural processes acting at the population level[15].

One of the most robust explanatory models is the **chewing-complex hypothesis**, which emphasizes the role of diet in shaping craniofacial form. For most of human evolutionary history, diets consisted of hard, fibrous, and minimally processed foods, imposing high masticatory demands. These functional pressures favored robust jaws, larger teeth, and often a more prognathic facial profile. The transition to agriculture and, later, to industrial food processing dramatically reduced masticatory load, allowing a gradual shift toward smaller jaws and more orthognathic facial configurations—a trend consistently documented in archaeological and comparative studies[16].

Crucially, the degree of prognathism varies **gradually across geographic space**. Comparative analyses of archaeological skulls and contemporary populations reveal clinal patterns rather than discrete groupings. Some populations in Australia or sub-Saharan Africa may, on average, exhibit more pronounced alveolar prognathism than populations in East Asia; however, overlap between populations is extensive, and variation within any single population often exceeds differences between population means. These gradients reflect histories of subsistence strategies, migration, and gene flow, not biologically meaningful racial boundaries[17].

Additional evolutionary mechanisms further contribute to this diversity. **Genetic drift**, particularly in small or isolated populations, can amplify certain craniofacial traits independently of adaptation, while **phenotypic plasticity** allows craniofacial development to respond dynamically to environmental and functional conditions during growth. Together, these processes reinforce the interpretation of prognathism as part of a

continuous spectrum of normal human variation[18].

3. Critical Perspective: Deconstructing a Racial Marker

Despite its clear biological grounding, prognathism acquired a disproportionate ideological significance during the 19th and early 20th centuries. In the intellectual climate of scientific racism, craniofacial traits were systematically detached from their developmental, functional, and evolutionary contexts and reinterpreted as fixed, inherited markers of human hierarchy. What had previously been understood as anatomical variation was reframed as biological destiny[19].

Racial anthropologists relied on simplified metrics—most notably the facial angle—to construct typological schemes that ranked human groups along a presumed evolutionary ladder. Orthognathic European faces were positioned as the normative and “advanced” standard, while prognathic African faces were relegated to the lower end of this hierarchy. Although these classifications were presented as objective and empirical, they were deeply influenced by colonial ideology, social stratification, and preexisting ethnocentric assumptions. Craniofacial morphology was thus conflated with intelligence, moral character, and cultural worth, transforming prognathism into a visual shorthand for racialized prejudice rather than a meaningful biological observation[20].

This process exemplifies a broader epistemological failure: the substitution of **description with explanation**. Measurements such as the facial angle quantified visible differences but were incorrectly treated as causal indicators of cognitive or moral traits. In doing so, early racial anthropology mistook correlation for

causation and ignored the polygenic, plastic, and environmentally responsive nature of craniofacial development. The authority of numbers and diagrams obscured the speculative foundations of these claims, granting them unwarranted scientific legitimacy[21].

The ideological misuse of prognathism also left a lasting imprint on aesthetic norms. Jaw projection came to be associated with primitiveness, deviation, and lack of refinement, reinforcing the illusion of a universal facial ideal rooted in Western craniofacial norms. Cultural anthropology has since demonstrated that perceptions of facial attractiveness and normality are profoundly culturally contingent. Features pathologized in one sociocultural context may be neutral or even positively valued in another. In the absence of functional impairment, prognathism therefore represents a phenotypic variant rather than a biological defect, and its social meaning cannot be disentangled from cultural interpretation.

Meta-analysis: Contemporary Scientific Consensus on Prognathism

A synthesis of research published over the past two decades in physical anthropology, population genetics, and orthodontics reveals a stable and unequivocal scientific consensus. Prognathism is now understood as the outcome of evolutionary adaptation, genetic complexity, and environmental modulation, distributed continuously across human populations. Its historical use

as a racial or taxonomic marker is categorically rejected[7,20].

Strong evidence links mandibular robustness and degrees of prognathism to subsistence strategies and masticatory load, while genetic studies confirm a polygenic basis characterized by gradual variation in allele frequencies rather than discrete population boundaries. Functional and environmental factors further shape phenotypic expression, particularly during critical periods of growth and development. Contemporary research no longer seeks to classify prognathism typologically, but instead focuses on elucidating its underlying biological mechanisms and optimizing individualized clinical management[5,21].

Conclusion: Recovering a Human Trait

Prognathism is best understood as a normal component of human craniofacial diversity rather than a marker of primitiveness or hierarchy. It reflects adaptive responses to diet, environment, and development, shaped by evolutionary and biocultural processes. Freed from racial ideology, its modern interpretation illustrates the maturity of the human sciences: the capacity to distinguish genuine biological variation from historically imposed social constructs. Today, prognathism occupies its rightful place as both a legitimate focus of dentofacial medicine and a meaningful element in the study of human evolutionary diversity.

References

1. Lieberman, D. E. (2011). *The Evolution of the Human Head*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
2. von Cramon-Taubadel, N. (2014). Global human mandibular variation reflects differences in agricultural and hunter-gatherer subsistence strategies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(3), 974–979.
3. Proffit, W. R., Fields, H. W., & Sarver, D. M. (2018). *Contemporary Orthodontics* (6th ed.). St. Louis: Elsevier.

4. Kuzminsky, S. C., & Gard, B. S. (2018). Revisiting the “racial” anthropology of the human dentition. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 165(4), 768–782.
5. Jang, J. Y., et al. (2020). Prevalence of mandibular prognathism and its association with genetic variants in Korean populations. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 1–9.
6. Larsen, C. S. (2015). *Bioarchaeology: Interpreting Behavior from the Human Skeleton* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. Ungar, P. S. (2017). *Evolution's Bite: A Story of Teeth, Diet, and Human Origins*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
8. Relethford, J. H. (2009). Race and global patterns of phenotypic variation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 139(1), 16–22.
9. Templeton, A. R. (2013). Biological races in humans. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Biological and Biomedical Sciences*, 44(3), 262–271.
10. Roseman, C. C. (2004). Detecting interregionally diversifying natural selection on modern human cranial form. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 123(4), 313–330.
11. Harvati, K., & Weaver, T. D. (2006). Human cranial anatomy and the differential preservation of population history. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 50(5), 474–483.
12. Ackerman, J. L., Proffit, W. R., & Sarver, D. M. (2007). The emerging soft tissue paradigm in orthodontic diagnosis and treatment planning. *American Journal of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics*, 131(4), 469–482.
13. Naini, F. B. (2011). Facial aesthetics: Concepts and clinical diagnosis. *British Dental Journal*, 210(8), 343–352.
14. Obwegeser, H. L. (2007). *Mandibular Prognathism and Orthognathic Surgery*. Chicago: Quintessence Publishing.
15. Gould, S. J. (1996). *The Mismeasure of Man* (Revised ed.). New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
16. Gravlee, C. C. (2009). How race becomes biology: Embodiment of social inequality. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 139(1), 47–57.
17. Montagu, A. (1942). *Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race*. New York: Columbia University Press.
18. Boas, F. (1912). *Changes in Bodily Form of Descendants of Immigrants*. New York: Columbia University Press.
19. American Association of Physical Anthropologists. (2019). AAPA Statement on Race and Racism. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 169(3), 400–402.
20. Peters, M., et al. (1998). Brain size and intelligence. *Intelligence*, 26(3), 235–250.
21. Kandel, E. R., et al. (2021). *Principles of Neural Science* (6th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
22. Shokraei, G., Agop-Forna, D., Dascălu, C., Fornă, N. (2025). Assessment of associations between sociodemographic and clinical factors and edentulism complications in patients scheduled for hybrid prosthetic therapy: A cross-sectional study. *Clinics and Practice*, 15(7)
23. Álvarez, G., Ceballos, F. C., & Quinteiro, C. (2009). The role of inbreeding in the extinction of a European royal dynasty. *PLoS ONE*, 4(4), e5174. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0005174>