The Origin of Extra Teeth in Mammals

POCHODZENIE DODATKOWYCH ZĘBÓW U SSAKÓW

Mieczysław WOLSAN

The occurrence of extra teeth in mammals is reviewed. It is suggested that most of the extra teeth may be interpreted either (1) as the effect of additional creation and development of a tooth germ, caused by the influence of genes which are rare but still present in the gene pool of a given species and which occurred much more frequently in those of its ancestral species, or (2) as the effect of development of a supernumerary tooth germ originated as a result of complete splitting of a tooth germ, which may be inherited or due to a mutation or a disturbance or change in the genetic control of tooth development. Supporting evidence for this hypothesis is presented.

[Institute of Systematic and Experimental Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Sławkowska 17, 31-016 Kraków, Poland]

The presence of extra teeth has been reported for nearly all orders of recent mammals, i.e. for the *Marsupialia* (e.g. Bateson, 1892; Peyer, 1968; Archer, 1975), *Insectivora* (e.g. Stein, 1963; Ruprecht, 1965a; Choate, 1968), *Chiroptera* (e.g. Eisentraut, 1956; Phillips & Jones, 1969; Phillips, 1971), *Primates* (e.g. Saarenmaa, 1951; Hooijer, 1952; Järvinen & Lehtinen, 1981), *Lagomorpha* (e.g. Darwin, 1868; Dawson, 1956; Hochstrasser, 1969), *Rodentia* (e.g. Johnson, 1952; Sheppe, 1964; Sofaer & Shaw, 1971), *Cetacea* (e.g. Ritchie & Edwards, 1913; Bourdelle & Grassé, 1955; Best, 1981). *Carnivora* (e.g. Long & Long, 1965; Kratochvíl, 1971; Wolsan, 1984), *Pinnipedia* (e.g. Bateson, 1892; Degerbøl, 1930; Caldwell, 1964), *Proboscidea* (e.g. Weber, 1904; Morrison-Scott, 1939; Frade, 1955), *Perissodactyla* (e.g. Bradley, 1903; Cook, 1929; Nieberle & Cohrs, 1970), and *Artiodactyla* (e.g. Neal & Kirkpatrick, 1957; Żurowski, 1970; Steele & Parama, 1981). In addition, mammalian remains with extra teeth have been found both in archaeological sites (e.g. Wing, 1965; Guilday & Parmalee, 1966; Taylor, 1971) and among fossils (e.g. McKenna, 1960; Fine, 1964; Fordyce, 1982). These extra teeth have occurred both in wild and reared mammals of both sexes, in all four tooth classes and two tooth generations, both in the upper and lower jaw, and both bilaterally and unilaterally, in the right or left jaw half. They are situated either within a tooth row, as peripheral or intercalary teeth, or outside it, internally or externally.

Many varying hypotheses have so far been presented to explain the origin of extra teeth in mammals. In my opinion, however, most of the extra teeth hitherto described in mammalian dentitions may be interpreted either

(1) as the effect of additional creation and development of a tooth germ, caused by the influence of genes which are rare but still present in the gene pool of a given species and which occurred much more frequently in those of its ancestral species (see Wolsan, 1983), or

(2) as the effect of development of a supernumerary tooth germ originated as a result of complete splitting of a tooth germ; the ability

for such a splitting may be inherited or due to a mutation or a disturbance or change in the genetic control of tooth development; such factors as, for instance, trauma, infection, and diet deficiencies may be regarded as sources of interference with the mechanism of this genetic control (cf. Hitchin, 1971).

(1)

The first interpretation applies to most of the extra teeth appearing in positions occupied in the ancestors of a given species by teeth lost in the course of subsequent evolution (e.g. Paradiso, 1966; Miller & Tessier, 1971; Neuenschwander & Lüps, 1975). The paleontological, ontogenetical, and morphological evidence indicates that such a loss in therian mammals has generally proceeded anteroposteriorly for the premolars and posteroanteriorly for the molars (Ziegler, 1971). It seems that both these directions have been involved in the incisor loss but the latter has undoubtedly been a dominant direction (e.g. Ziegler, 1971; Schwartz, 1974; Wolsan, 1984). In early therian mammals there was only one canine in each jaw quadrant (Ziegler, 1971; Bown & Kraus, 1979), which has been lost in many descendant groups. The progressive simplification in shape and simultaneous reduction in size of a tooth have clearly preceded its loss (e.g. Kurtén, 1953; Ziegler, 1971; Hendey, 1980). This process has been related to gradients of tooth shape and size, which are to be found in nearly all mammalian dentitions. Two theories have been proposed to explain the presence of these gradients, i.e. the Field Theory (Butler, 1939) and the Clone Theory (Osborn, 1978). In the terms of both these theories it is impossible for a tooth developed individually from its own germ not to form in accordance with such a gradient. Therefore, only those mammalian extra teeth can be under consideration in the terms of my first interpretation, which, firstly, occur as a canine in those dentitions which are typically devoid of the tooth, or as the peripheral teeth in the incisor and cheek dentitions, or exceptionally, in some mammals, in other positions (e.g. Ziegler, 1971), however only those which have clearly been affected by the phylogenetic tooth loss, secondly, are both small and simple in shape, the smallest and simplest among the teeth of their tooth classes, and thirdly (only for the extra teeth occurring in dentitions with gradients of tooth shape and size), are formed in accordance with the gradients in their tooth classes.

If all living mammalian populations were to be gathered together, it would be possible to arrange them in increasing sequence according to the frequencies of phenotypes with extra teeth complying with the above-mentioned requirements. Thus, for instance, the occurrence of the upper canine was observed, among other frequencies, in $0^0/_0$ (0 of 7, 0 of 10, 0 of 15, and 0 of 16), $2.0^0/_0$ (1 of 50), $5.9^0/_0$ (1 of 17), and $16.7^0/_0$ (3 of 18) of the specimens of *Capreolus capreolus* from seven various areas of England and Scotland (Chaplin & Atkinson, 1968), and in $17.9^0/_0$ (29 of 162) of a sample of *Odocoileus virginianus* from San Patricio County, Texas (Knowlton & Glazener, 1965), while the second lower molar was found, for example, in $6.5^0/_0$ (2 of 31) and $13.6^0/_0$ (3 of 22) of samples of *Lynx lynx* from Sweden and Finland respectively

(Kurtén, 1963). Matyushkin (1979) claims that the second lower molar occurs in *Lynx lynx* in not less than 3—5⁰/o of the specimens, and in some populations its frequency exceeds 20—30⁰/o. Furthermore, there are mammalian populations in which the teeth, developed in accordance with the requirements mentioned above, are present approximately as often as absent (e.g. second premolars in some subspecies of *Mustela frenata;* Hall, 1951). There are, finally, those in which the frequency of the phenotype with such a tooth exceeds that with the tooth lost, reaching 100⁰/o in some populations. For instance, the second upper premolar was found in 78.1⁰/o (125 of 160) of a sample of *Felis bengalensis,* occurring with different frequencies in various populations of the sample (Glass & Todd, 1975, 1977), and, among other frequencies, in 71.6⁰/o (48 of 67), 88.3⁰/o (227 of 257), and 90.3⁰/o (131 of 145) of the specimens of *Felis catus* from the Kerguelen Archipelago, the Bern region, and Geneva respectively (Lüps, 1980).

Such a presence-absence tooth polymorphism has also been discovered in fossil mammals and, in addition, gradual changes in the frequencies of phenotypes with a tooth presence have been traced in successive species of an evolving lineage (e.g. Simpson, 1946; Kurtén, 1953, 1956). It is generally agreed that shape, size, and presence or absence of a tooth are under a strong genetic control and that a group of genes rather than a single gene is responsible for this. Thus, it seems very probable that the genes of such a group have been present in genotypes in qualitatively different compositions, resulting in phenotypes differing from each other in shape, size, and presence or absence of a given tooth, and that their frequencies have gradually changed with time in the gene pool of a population, resulting in different frequencies of the phenotypes in that population.

(2)

The second interpretation may apply to supernumerary teeth appearing in any position. Such teeth are usually very similar in shape to an adjacent one in a tooth row (e.g. Ruprecht, 1965b; Berkovitz & Musgrave, 1971; Wolsan, 1984), which suggests their common origin from one tooth germ. Moreover, they are often formed in unconformity to gradients of tooth shape and size in their tooth classes (e.g. Dolgov & Rossolimo, 1964: Fig. 2; Lüps, 1977: Fig. 1a; Buchalczyk *et al.,* 1981: Fig. 3), which, in terms of the Field and Clone Theories, excludes the possibility of their origin from individual tooth germs. Mammalian dentitions provide many examples which illustrate the successive stages in the process of tooth splitting. Hence, many mammalian teeth with signs of incomplete splitting, varying in degree of expression, have so far been described (e.g. Agduhr, 1921; Pavlinov, 1975; Wolsan, 1984). Furthermore, supernumerary teeth having an alveolus either partly or entirely united with that of an adjacent tooth have also been observed in mammals (Dolgov & Rossolimo, 1964; Bateman, 1970). Histological studies of the development of supernumerary teeth and teeth with signs of incomplete splitting have shown that such teeth in mammals may originate respectively as a result of complete or incomplete splitting of a tooth germ (e.g. Hitchin & Morris, 1966; Hitchin, 1971; Berkovitz & Thomson, 1973).

Considerable evidence has so far been accumulated to prove that such teeth may be inherited or due to a mutation (e.g. Miles, 1954; Hitchin, 1970; Kalter, 1980). Glasstone (1952) demonstrated that each part of a tooth germ cut in half may develop into a complete tooth, and Hitchin & Naylor (1964) showed that an infection may lead to the splitting of a tooth germ. Finally, Burn *et. al.*, (1937) have described supernumerary teeth whose occurrence may be caused by a deficiency of vitamin A in the diet.

REFERENCES

Agduhr E., 1921: Beitrag zur Kenntnis der kongenitalen Anomalien des Canidengebisses. Kungl. Svenska Vetenskapsakad. Handlingar, *61*, 17: 1—55. — Archer M., 1975: Abnormal dental development and its significance in dasyurids and other marsupials. Mem. Queensl. Mus., *17:* 251—265. — Bateman J. A., 1970: Supernumerary incisors in Mustelids. Mammal Rev., *1:* 81—86. — Bateson W., 1892: On numerical variation in teeth, with a discussion of the conception of homology. Proc. zool. Soc. Lond., 1892: 102—115. — Berkovitz B. K. B. & Musgrave J. H., 1971: A rare dental abnormality in an adult male Orang-utan (*Pongo pygmaeus*): bilateral supernumerary maxillary premolars. J. Zool., Lond., *164:* 266—268. — Berkovitz B. K. B. & Thomson P., 1973: Observations on the aetiology of supernumerary upper incisors in the albino ferret (*Mustela putorius*). Arch. oral Biol., *18:* 457—463. — Best R. C., 1981: The tusk of the narwhal (*Monodon monoceros* L.): interpretation of its function (*Mammalia: Cetacea*). Canad. J. Zool., *59:* 2386—2393. — Bourdelle E. & Grassé P.-P., 1955: Ordre der Cétacés (*Cetacea* Brisson 1762; *Cete* Linné 1758). [In: »Traité de Zoologie: Anatomie, Systématique, Biologie. Tome XVII: Mammifères. Les Ordres: Anatomie, Éthologie, Systématique. Fasc. 1«. P.-P. Grassé, ed.]. Masson et Cie: 341—438+445—450. Paris. — Bown T. M. & Kraus M. J., 1979: Origin of the tribosphenic molar and metatherian and eutherian dental formulae. [In: »Mesozoic mammals: the first two-thirds of mammalian history«. J. A. Lillegraven, Z. Kielan-Jaworowska, W. A. Clemens, eds.]. Univ. California Press: 172—181. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London. — Bradley O. C., 1903: Two cases of supernumerary molars: with remarks on the form of the lower cheek-teeth of the horse. Anat. Anz., *24:* 112—119. — Buchalczyk T., Dynowski J. & Szteyn S., 1981: Variations in number of teeth and asymmetry of the skull in the wolf. Acta theriol., *26:* 23—30. — Burn C. G., Orten A. W. & Smith A. H., 1937: [...]. J. dent. Res., *16:* 317 [after Hitchin (1971)]. — Butler P. M., 1939: Studies of the mammalian dentition. Differentiation of the postcanine dentition. Proc. zool. Soc. Lond., Ser. B, *109:* 1—36. — Caldwell D. K., 1964: Tusk twinning in the Pacific walrus, J. Mammal., *45:* 490—491. — Chaplin R. E. & Atkinson J., 1968: The occurrence of upper canine teeth in Roe deer (*Capreolus capreolus*) from England and Scotland. J. Zool., Lond., *155:* 141—144. — Choate J. R., 1968: Dental abnormalities in the short-tailed shrew, *Blarina brevicauda*. J. Mammal., *49:* 251—258. — Cook H. J., 1929: Occurrence of a true fourth molar in a modern horse. J. Mammal., *10:* 82—83. — Darwin C., 1868: Das Variiren der Thiere und Pflanzen im Zustande der Domestication. Band 1. E. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagshandlung (E. Koch): I—VIII+1—530. Stuttgart. — Dawson M. M., 1956: Extra teeth in a hare. J. Mammal., *37:* 453—454. — Degerbøl M., 1930: Om 3 Tilfaelde af dobbelte Stødtaender hos Hvalrossen (*Odobenus rosmarus* L.), Vidensk. Medd. Dansk naturhist. Foren. København, *88:* 287—292. — Dolgov V. A. & Rossolimo O. L., 1964: Slučai anomalij v zubnoj sisteme volka, *Canis lupus* Linnaeus, 1758. Acta theriol., *8:* 237—244. — Eisentraut M., 1956: Beitrag zur Chiropteren-Fauna von Kamerun (Westafrika). Zool. Jb. (Syst.), *84:* 505—540. — Fine M. D., 1964: An abnormal P$_2$ in *Canis* cf. *C. latrans* from the Hagerman fauna of Idaho. J. Mammal., *45:* 483—485. — Fordyce R. E., 1982: Dental anomaly in a fossil squalodont dolphin from New Zealand, and the evolution of polydonty in whales. N. Z. J. Zool., *9:* 419—425. — Frade F., 1955: Ordre des Proboscidiens (*Proboscidea* Illiger, 1811). [In: »Traité de Zoologie: Anatomie, Systématique, Biologie. Tome XVII: Mammifères. Les Ordres: Anatomie, Éthologie, Systématique. Fasc. 1«. P.-P., Grassé, ed.]. Masson et Cie: 715—783+868—873. Paris. — Glass G. E.

& Todd N. B., 1975: Polymorphism for the occurrence of the second upper premolar in *Felis bengalensis:* implications for the interpretation of fossil felid materials. Carnivore Genet. Newsl., *2:* 297—305. — Glass G. E. & Todd N. B., 1977: Quasi-continuous variation of the second upper premolar in *Felis bengalensis* Kerr, 1792 and its significance for some fossil lynxes. Z. Säugetierk., *42:* 36—44. — Glasstone S., 1952: The development of halved tooth germs. A study in experimental embryology. J. Anat., *86:* 12—15. — Guilday J. E. & Parmalee P. W., 1966: Lower third molar in *Procyon.* J. Mammal., *47:* 149—151. — Hall E. R., 1951: American weasels. Univ. Kansas Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist., *4:* 1—466. — Hendey Q. B., 1980: *Agriotherium (Mammalia, Ursidae)* from Langebaanweg, South Africa, and relationships of the genus. Ann. S. Afr. Mus., *81:* 1—109. — Hitchin A. D., 1970: The impacted maxillary incisor. Dent. Practit., *20:* 423—433. — Hitchin A. D., 1971: The aetiology of the calcified composite odontomes. Brit. dent. J., *130:* 475—482. — Hitchin A. D. & Morris I., 1966: Geminated odontome — connation of the incisors in the dog — its etiology and ontogeny. J. dent. Res., *45:* 575—583. — Hitchin A. D. & Naylor M. N., 1964: Acute maxillitis of infancy. Oral Surg., *18:* 423—431. — Hochstrasser G., 1969: Ein überzähliger Prämolar beim Hauska-ninchen und das Problem der Polyodontie bei Lagomorphen. Zool. Beitr., N. F., *15:* 33—39. — Hooijer D. A., 1952: Notes on the dentition of the golden monkey, *Rhinopithecus.* J. Mammal., *33:* 258—260. — Järvinen S. & Lehtinen L., 1981: Supernumerary and congenitally missing primary teeth in Finnish children. An epidemiologic study. Acta odont. scand., *39:* 83—86. — Johnson D. H., 1952: The occurrence and significance of extra molar teeth in rodents. J. Mammal., *33:* 70—72. — Kalter H., 1980: A compendium of the genetically induced congenital malformations of the house mouse. Teratology, *21:* 397—429. — Knowlton F. F. & Glazener W. C., 1965: Incidence of maxillary canine teeth in white-tailed deer from San Patricio County, Texas. J. Mammal., *46:* 352. — Kratochvíl Z., 1971: Oligodonty and polyodonty in the domestic cat (*Felis silvestris* f. *catus* L.) and the wild cat (*Felis silvestris silvestris* Schreber). Acta vet. Brno, *40:* 33—40. — Kurtén B., 1953: On the variation and population dynamics of fossil and recent mammal populations. Acta zool. fenn., *76:* 1—122. — Kurtén B., 1956: The status and affinities of *Hyaena sinensis* Owen and *Hyaena ultima* Matsumoto. Amer. Mus. Novit., *1764:* 1—48. — Kurtén B., 1963: Return of a lost structure in the evolution of the felid dentition. Comment. biol., *26,* 4: 1—12. — Long C. A. & Long C. F., 1965: Dental abnormalities in North American badgers, genus *Taxidea.* Trans. Kansas Acad. Sci., *68:* 145—155. — Lüps P., 1977: Gebiß- und Zahnvariationen an einer Serie von 257 Hauskatzen (*Felis silvestris* f. *catus* L., 1758) (*Mammalia, Felidae*). Zool. Abh. Mus. Tierk. Dresden, *34:* 155—165. — Lüps P., 1980: Verglei-chende Untersuchung am zweiten oberen Vorbackenzahn P² der Hauskatze *Felis silvestris* f. *catus.* Z. Säugetierk., *45:* 245—249. — Matyushkin E. N., 1979: Rysi Golarktiki. Sb. Trudov zool. Muz. MGU, *18:* 76—162. — McKenna M. C., 1960: The *Geolabidinae*, a new subfamily of early Cenozoic erinaceoid insectivores. Univ. California Publ. Geol. Sci., *37:* 131—164. — Miles A. E. W., 1954: Malformations of the teeth. Proc. r. Soc. Med., *47:* 817—826. — Miller F. L. & Tessier G. D., 1971: Dental anomalies in caribou, *Rangifer tarandus.* J. Mammal., *52:* 164—174. — Morrison-Scott T. C. S., 1939: On the occurrence of a presumed first milk-molar (*m. m.* 1) in African elephants. Proc. zool. Soc. Lond., Ser. B, *108:* 711—713. — Neal B. J. & Kirkpatrick R. D., 1957: Anomalous canine tooth development in an Arizona peccary. J. Mammal., *38:* 420. — Neuenschwander A. & Lüps P., 1975: Zahnvariationen bei einer Mauswiesel-Population, *Mustela nivalis* Linné, 1766, aus Hessen. Säugetierk. Mitt., *23:* 85—93. — Nieberle K. & Cobrs P., 1970: Lehrbuch der speziellen pathologischen Anatomie der Haustiere. Teil 1. VEB Gustav Fisher Verlag: 1—695. Jena. — Osborn J. W., 1978: Morphogenetic gradients: fields versus clones. [In: »Development, function and evolution of teeth«. P. M. Butler, K. A. Joysey, eds.]. Acad. Press: 171—201. London, New York, and San Francisco. — Paradiso J. L., 1966: Notes on supernumerary and missing teeth in the coyote. Mammalia, *30:* 120—128. — Pavlinov I. Ya., 1975: Tooth anomalies in some *Canidae.* Acta theriol., *20:* 507—519. — Pever B., 1968: Comparative odontology. Univ. Chicago Press: I—XVI+1—347. Chicago and London. — Phillips C. J., 1971: The dentition of glossophagine bats: development, morphological characteristics, variation, pathology, and evoluation. Misc. Publ., Mus. Nat. Hist., *54:* 1—138. — Phillips C. J. & Jones J. K., Jr., 1969: Dental abnormalities in North American bats. I. *Emballonuridae, Noctilionidae,* and

Chilonycteridae. Trans. Kansas Acad. Sci., *71:* 509—520. — Ritchie J. & Edwards A. J. H., 1913: On the occurrence of functional teeth in the upper jaw of the Sperm Whale. Proc. r. Soc. Edinburgh, *33:* 166—168. — Ruprecht A., 1965a: Anomalies of the teeth and asymmetry of the skull in *Erinaceus europaeus* Linnaeus, 1758. Acta theriol., *10:* 234—236. — Ruprecht A., 1965b: Supernumerary premolar in *Mustela putorius* Linnaeus, 1758. Acta theriol., *10:* 242. — Saarenmaa L., 1951: The origin of the supernumerary teeth. Acta odont. scand., *9:* 293—303. — Schwartz J. H., 1974: Observations on the dentition of the *Indriidae.* Amer. J. phys. Anthrop., *41:* 107—114. — Sheppe W., 1964: Supernumerary teeth in the deer mouse, *Peromyscus.* Z. Säugetierk., *29:* 33—36. — Simpson G. G., 1946: *Palaeogale* and allied early mustelids. Amer. Mus. Novit., *1320:* 1—14. — Sofaer J. A. & Shaw J. H., 1971: The genetics and development of fused and supernumerary molars in the rice rat. J. Embryol. exp. Morph., *26:* 99—109. — Steele D. G. & Parama W. D., 1981: Frequencies of dental anomalies and their potential effect on determining MNI counts. Plains Anthrop., *26—91:* 51—54. — Stein G. H. W., 1963: Anomalien der Zahnzahl und ihre geographische Variabilität bei Insectivoren: II Maulwurf, *Talpa europaea* L. Mitt. zool. Mus. Berlin, *39:* 223—240. — Taylor R. M. S., 1971: Dental report on archaeological material from Tonga. Aust. dent. J., *16:* 175—181. — Weber M., 1904: Die Säugetiere. Verlag von Gustav Fischer: I—XII+1—866. Jena. — Wing E. S., 1965: Abnormal dentition in several white-tailed deer jaws. J. Mammal., *46:* 348—350. — Wolsan M., 1983: Ancestral characters in the dentition of the weasel *Mustela nivalis* L. (*Carnivora, Mustelidae*). Ann. zool. fenn., *20:* 47—51. — Wolsan M., 1984: Concerning the variation in the number, shape and size of incisors in fissiped carnivores. Acta zool. cracov., *27:* 107—119. — Ziegler A. C., 1971: A theory of the evolution of therian dental formulas and replacement patterns. Quart. Rev. Biol., *46:* 226—249. — Żurowski W., 1970: Additional molar in European red deer. Acta theriol., *15:* 523—525.

Possibility of Freemartinism in Roe Deer [1]

MOŻLIWOŚĆ WYSTĘPOWANIA FRYMARTYNIZMU U SARNY

Paweł S. SYSA & Jan KAŁUZIŃSKI

Sysa P. S. & Kałuziński J., 1984: Possibility of freemartinism in roe deer. Acta theriol., 29, 10: 133—137 [With Plate I]

Cytogenetic analysis was made in female roe deer, *Capreolus capreolus* (Linnaeus, 1758), belonging to members of heterosexual triplets. Lymphocytic chimerism was not discovered, the karyotype being defined as 70,XX. The result obtained justifies the assumption that in cases of twin or multiple pregnancy of unlike sexes in the roe deer there is no development of infertility in the females etiologically similar to the freemartinism syndrome in domestic cattle.

[Warsaw Agric. Univ., Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, 02—766 Warszawa, ul. Nowoursynowska 166 (PS); Polish Hunting Association, 62-055 Czempiń, Poland (JK)]