



Received: 02 Sep 2026
Revised: 28 Sep 2026
Accepted: 07 Oct 2026
Published: 25 Oct 2026

Volume 12 Issue 10, 2026
Page No - 69-76
DOI - 10.55640/ijmsdh-12-10-07

Article Citation: Kaynak, O. (2026). The Mental Somersault: An Evolutionary Developmental Hypothesis Based on Vertical Trunk Orientation, Intrauterine Mechanical Forces, and Interspecies Embryo Transfer in Human Evolution. *International Journal of Medical Science and Dental Health*, 12(10), 69-76. <https://doi.org/10.55640/ijmsdh-12-10-07>

Copyright: © 2026 The Authors. Published by IJMSDH under the Creative Commons CC BY License

The Mental Somersault: An Evolutionary Developmental Hypothesis Based on Vertical Trunk Orientation, Intrauterine Mechanical Forces, and Interspecies Embryo Transfer in Human Evolution

 **Oktay Kaynak**
Independent Evolutionary Theorist

Abstract

The defining features of human evolution—including bipedalism, upright trunk orientation, changes in facial morphology, and particularly the substantial increase in brain volume—represent some of the most important explanatory challenges in paleoanthropology. This study presents the **Mental Somersault Hypothesis**, which proposes that, at certain stages of human evolution, developmental conditions and intrauterine mechanical forces may have played a causal role alongside genetic changes. The central assumption of the hypothesis is that the emergence of vertical trunk orientation in the human lineage may have altered not only adult anatomy but also the gravitational forces, hydrostatic pressure, tissue resistance, and mechanical stress fields to which the embryo was exposed during gestation.

This approach combines Erich Blechschmidt's biodynamic perspective on the role of internal and external force fields in embryonic morphogenesis with modern concepts from mechanobiology and mechanotransduction. Accordingly, embryonic development should not be understood solely as the linear execution of a predetermined genetic program, but rather as a dynamic interaction between genetic capacity and the physical developmental environment.

A more advanced form of the hypothesis asks whether modifying the developmental environment across species could produce morphological differences in embryos with the same or closely related genetic backgrounds. In this context, the classical “Geep” study on sheep-goat embryonic chimerism is considered a model demonstrating that the interspecies embryonic developmental environment can be experimentally modified. However, this finding is not claimed to be directly transferable to a human-chimpanzee system.

The principal original proposal of this study is that the Mental Somersault Hypothesis should not be tested through



direct human-animal gestational experiments, but initially through biomechanical modeling, finite element analysis (FEA), computational fluid dynamics (CFD), organoid systems, and appropriate animal models. The hypothesis is falsifiable if no reproducible and quantitative differences are found, relative to control groups, in predefined morphological variables such as cranial geometry, brain volume, facial projection, and spinal orientation.

Keywords: human evolution, Mental Somersault, vertical trunk orientation, bipedalism, embryonic development, mechanobiology, mechanotransduction, biodynamic embryology, interspecies embryo transfer, cranial development, Evo-Devo.

1. Introduction

Human evolution should be understood not merely as the genetic transformation of a species, but also as the simultaneous transformation of its body plan, developmental environment, and behavioral capacities.

One of the most striking differences between humans and other great apes is that humans became fully bipedal and vertically oriented. This transformation altered not only the locomotor system but also the geometry of the pelvis, spine, birth canal, and physical environment in which the fetus develops during gestation.

My hypothesis, which I call the **Mental Somersault Hypothesis**, begins at precisely this point.

The central question of the hypothesis is:

Could the emergence of vertical trunk orientation have altered not only the anatomy of the born individual but also the mechanical developmental environment of the embryo within the maternal uterus?

If this question is answered affirmatively, phenotypic changes in human evolution could be explained not only through the accumulation of mutations but also through systematic changes in the developmental environment.

In the model I propose, gravity is not regarded as the sole cause of evolutionary change. Gravity must be considered together with body geometry, intrauterine fluids, embryonic orientation, the mechanical resistance of maternal tissues, internal pressures, and the interactions among developing tissues.

For this reason, it would be inaccurate to reduce the Mental Somersault Hypothesis to the statement that “gravity enlarged the brain.”

More comprehensively, the hypothesis proposes the following sequence:

vertical trunk orientation → altered gestational geometry → altered mechanical/hydrodynamic environment → developmental mechanotransduction → morphological change

The theoretical background of this approach is related to Blechschmidt’s biodynamic understanding of embryology. In Blechschmidt’s approach, embryonic form is not merely the mechanical execution of a genetic “program”; the interaction between developing tissues and internal and external forces is considered an important component of morphogenesis.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1 Genetic capacity and the developmental environment

This hypothesis does not reject genetic mechanisms.

On the contrary, it proposes that while the genetic structure determines the capacities and limits necessary for development, the developmental environment may influence which phenotypic outcomes emerge from that capacity.

This distinction is important.

The fact that an organism’s genetic structure remains unchanged does not mean that no morphological changes can occur during development. The effects of mechanical forces on cell behavior, cell proliferation, differentiation, and tissue organization during development constitute major areas of research in modern mechanobiology.

Ingber’s approach to mechanotransduction is also relevant in this context.

Accordingly, the modern biological counterpart of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is not the rejection of genetic determinism, but rather the integrated consideration of:

genetic regulation + mechanical environment + developmental plasticity

3. The Concept of the Mental Somersault

I use the term “Mental Somersault” to describe a critical developmental transformation in human evolution.

The term “somersault” should not be interpreted as meaning that the uterus itself became a vertical organ.

The primary variable is the human **vertical trunk orientation**.



Vertical trunk orientation produced a comprehensive anatomical transformation affecting the embryo's orientation within the uterus, the influence of gravitational vectors, the position of maternal organs, the shape of the pelvis, and the geometry of the birth canal.

The mechanical model of the Mental Somersault can therefore be expressed as follows:

vertical trunk orientation → a new gravitational vector → reorientation of the embryo → altered internal/external force balance → new growth vectors in cranial and brain development.

Cranial development is particularly important in this hypothesis.

The brain and skull are not independent systems. The volumetric expansion of developing brain tissue continuously interacts with the developmental constraints of the skull.

4. Blechschmidt and Biodynamic Embryology

One of the theoretical foundations for the developmental mechanism proposed by the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is Erich Blechschmidt's approach to biodynamic embryology.

In Blechschmidt's approach, the embryo is not regarded as a passive structure. During development, mechanical relationships arise among tissues, including pushing, pulling, tension, compression, and fluid pressure.

Blechschmidt's approach is particularly relevant to cranial development, in which the embryonic skull is understood as being shaped under the influence of internal and external vectorial forces.

The significance of this idea for the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is clear.

If the final morphology of the developing skull is not determined solely by genetic information but is also influenced by the physical developmental environment, then a systematic change in that environment may produce morphological consequences.

This leads to the following testable proposition:

Embryos with the same or closely related genetic developmental programs may exhibit different cranial growth geometries when developing in different and controlled mechanical environments.

This proposition constitutes the testable core of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis.

5. Changes in the Intrauterine Mechanical Environment

The embryo within the uterus is not exposed to a single force.

At least the following physical parameters should be considered together:

1. The gravitational vector,
2. amniotic fluid pressure,
3. the embryo's internal fluid pressures,
4. the mechanical resistance of the uterine wall,
5. the positional and mechanical effects of maternal tissues,
6. the embryo's growth rate,
7. gestational duration,
8. nutritional and oxygenation conditions.

In Blechschmidt's model, the emergence of developmental form is understood through the dynamic relationship between internal expansion and external resistance. This relationship is particularly relevant to the development of the brain and skull.

The Mental Somersault Hypothesis adds another variable to this framework:

the geometric orientation of the developmental environment.

In other words, not only the magnitude of pressure but also its direction and the spatial distribution of force fields are important.

6. The Interspecies Embryo Transfer Hypothesis

The most radical experimental proposal of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is to modify the developmental environment across species.

For this reason, the full name of the theory is formulated as:

The Interspecies Embryo Transfer Theory

The conceptual core of the hypothesis is based on the following question, posed in 1974:

If a chimpanzee embryo developed in a different gestational environment created by the vertical trunk orientation of a human, what would happen morphologically?

This is not merely a question about interspecies gestation. The fundamental question is:

When the developmental environment of an embryo is systematically altered, which aspects of the phenotype change?



Therefore, carrying out an actual human-chimpanzee pregnancy is not a necessary condition of the theory.

On the contrary, such an experiment would not constitute an acceptable research method under current biological and ethical standards.

The chromosomal differences between humans and chimpanzees, differences in gestational duration, placental communication, and immunological problems all present substantial barriers.

Accordingly, the proposal here is not to conduct a live human-animal gestation, but to **disentangle and test the hypothesis experimentally in a safe manner.**

7. The Geep Experiment: An Experimental Model

A biologically important model for the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is the 1984 sheep-goat embryonic chimera study by Meinecke-Tillmann and Meinecke.

In that study, sheep and goat embryonic structures were combined using microsurgical methods, and the role of the embryo's outer layer in sustaining gestation was investigated.

The study was published in Nature:

Meinecke-Tillmann & Meinecke, 1984, Nature, 307, 637–638.
The conclusion I draw from this experiment is:

The developmental environment of an embryo can be experimentally modified.

However, the following conclusion should not be drawn:

“The results observed in the goat-sheep experiment have been proven to occur in the same way in a human-chimpanzee system.”

Such an inference would be scientifically excessive.

The Geep experiment can be used only as a biological model supporting the first stage of the hypothesis:

embryo + different developmental environment → possibility of different developmental outcomes.

The central test of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is whether this environmental modification changes the **direction of morphological development.**

8. Morphological Predictions in Human Evolution

If the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is correct, the influence of vertical trunk orientation on the developmental environment should produce several morphological consequences.

8.1. Cranial geometry

The first prediction concerns cranial geometry.

According to the hypothesis, altered mechanical force fields may influence the growth directions of developing cranial tissues.

In particular, the following are measurable variables:

- the height of the cranial vault,
- development of the frontal region,
- the geometry of the cranial base,
- the width-to-height ratio,
- the relationship between the face and the cranium.

8.2. Brain volume

The second prediction concerns brain volume. A crucial point must be emphasized here:

The Mental Somersault Hypothesis should not propose the simplistic causal claim that “mechanical pressure directly enlarges the brain.”

A more accurate formulation is:

Changes in the mechanical environment may alter the growth constraints and spatial organization of developing neural tissue.

Accordingly, brain volume, brain surface area, ventricular geometry, and cortical organization should be measured separately.

8.3. Facial morphology

The third prediction concerns facial projection.

If the mechanical model of the hypothesis is correct, changes in the developmental relationship between the cranial base and the face may produce changes in prognathism and anterior facial projection.

However, this prediction is not a directly established result; it remains a hypothesis requiring experimental testing.

9. The “Sudden Leap” Hypothesis

A second evolutionary dimension of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis concerns the rate of morphological change.



The hypothesis proposes that some major morphological transformations in human evolution do not necessarily have to be explained solely by the long-term accumulation of small mutations.

A major change in the developmental environment may produce substantial morphological differences over relatively short timescales through phenotypic plasticity.

An important distinction must be made here:

Phenotypic change and hereditary evolution are not the same thing.

The fact that an organism develops a different morphology because of its intrauterine environment does not mean that this morphology will automatically be transmitted hereditarily to subsequent generations.

Therefore, the second stage of the evolutionary mechanism proposed by the Mental Somersault Hypothesis concerns the heritability of developmental change.

This is not a weakness of the theory. Rather, it is a fundamental area of investigation that must be clearly defined and experimentally tested.

10. Mechanotransduction and Epigenetics

Modern mechanobiology demonstrates that physical forces can be detected by cells and can influence cellular signaling pathways.

This mechanism is important for the Mental Somersault Hypothesis. Mechanical force may act through the following sequence:

mechanical stress → mechanosensors at the cell surface → intracellular signaling pathways → changes in gene expression → cellular behavior → tissue morphology

Accordingly, the contemporary version of the theory does not claim that mechanical force directly alters the DNA sequence.

A more defensible proposition is:

The mechanical environment may contribute to phenotypic differences by influencing gene activity and cellular behavior during development.

This approach establishes a conceptual bridge between modern mechanobiology and the historical biodynamic origins of the theory.

11. Testability and Falsifiability

The fundamental condition for evaluating the Mental Somersault Hypothesis as a scientific hypothesis is to define in advance which results would support it and which results would weaken it.

I therefore propose the following falsifiability criterion:

If no reproducible differences are found between experimental models developed under controlled mechanical conditions and control groups in terms of cranial geometry, brain morphology, and facial development, the central mechanical assumption of the hypothesis will be weakened.

A stronger falsification criterion would be:

If controlled and meaningful changes are introduced into the mechanical environment but developmental morphology remains unchanged independently of those changes, the hypothesis will be substantially weakened.

The hypothesis may be tested using FEA and CFD, and the absence of morphological change would constitute evidence against its central claims.

Popper's philosophy of science may be relevant here; however, falsifiability alone does not demonstrate that a hypothesis is true.

Falsifiability merely demonstrates that the hypothesis is scientifically testable.

12. Experimental Testing Strategy

Instead of human-chimpanzee embryo transfer, I propose that the hypothesis be tested through the following stages.

Stage 1 — Biomechanical modeling

A three-dimensional model of the embryonic skull should be constructed. The model should include:

- tissue elasticity,
- suture geometry,
- fontanelle regions,
- fluid pressure,
- external mechanical forces.

Stage 2 — FEA

Finite element analysis should be used to calculate the effects of different force vectors on the skull.



FEA could be used for this purpose, including the conversion of early chimpanzee fetal cranial geometry into a numerical model.

Stage 3 — CFD

Amniotic and embryonic fluid dynamics should be modeled using computational fluid dynamics.

The objective should be to determine not only total pressure but also pressure gradients and flow directions.

Stage 4 — Cellular mechanobiology

The effects of mechanical stress on cellular responses could then be investigated using organoid or other appropriate cellular systems.

The following variables should be measured:

- cell proliferation,
- differentiation,
- mechanosensor activity,
- gene expression,
- tissue organization.

Stage 5 — Animal models

Without using humans or chimpanzees, the controlled modification of the intrauterine mechanical environment in developmentally appropriate animal models, followed by measurement of cranial morphology, could provide a critical test of the hypothesis.

This stage is particularly important because, although the theory concerns human evolution, the mechanism itself can be investigated experimentally in nonhuman systems.

13. Quantitative Hypotheses for FEA/CFD

For the Mental Somersault Hypothesis to become a scientific model, qualitative statements such as “the skull grows” are insufficient.

The following quantitative variables should be defined in advance:

H1

Changing the direction of the mechanical force vector alters the orientation of cranial growth.

H2

Changing the mechanical environment produces a measurable difference in the cranial length-to-height ratio.

H3

Changing the mechanical environment affects frontal cranial expansion and vault height.

H4

Changes in the mechanical environment produce measurable differences in the growth regions of neural tissue.

H5

The magnitude of these differences is related to the direction and intensity of the mechanical load.

H6

If no effect is observed, or if the effect can be fully explained by uncontrolled biological variables, the mechanical causality claim of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is weakened.

14. Relationship to the Fossil Record

The Mental Somersault Hypothesis should not treat the fossil record as a direct experimental result.

Fossils provide **comparative morphological data** relevant to the theory. In particular, the following variables should be evaluated together:

- cranial volume,
- frontal expansion,
- facial projection,
- cranial base morphology,
- spine-pelvis relationships,
- indicators of bipedalism.

Some features, such as the sagittal crest in *Australopithecus* species, have been associated with birth and mechanical deformation processes.

However, these interpretations must be independently tested through fossil morphology.

Claiming that a fossil feature is a prediction of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis does not prove that the feature was actually produced by the hypothesis.

Therefore, the relationship between the theory and fossil evidence should be established through the sequence:

prediction → measurement → comparison

15. Relationship of the Theory to Mainstream Evolutionary Biology



The purpose of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is not to eliminate the genetic theory of evolution.

A more accurate statement is:

The hypothesis proposes that genetic change and the developmental mechanical environment should be considered together when explaining human evolution.

Accordingly, the theory may be related to Evolutionary Developmental Biology (Evo-Devo), mechanobiology, phenotypic plasticity, and developmental systems biology.

Nevertheless, there is currently insufficient empirical evidence for the theory to replace fundamental evolutionary mechanisms such as common ancestry, natural selection, or genetic inheritance.

The claim of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis should therefore be formulated in a more limited but more testable manner:

The emergence of vertical trunk orientation in the human lineage may have systematically altered not only the adult locomotor system but also the embryonic developmental environment, thereby creating a developmental mechanism that has not yet received sufficient attention in explanations of human morphological evolution.

16. Discussion

The most important implication of this study is that the dichotomy of “genes versus environment” is insufficient for explaining human evolution.

The embryo develops through a continuous interaction between genetic information and the physical environment.

For this reason, two different timescales in human evolution must be distinguished:

1. Developmental time:

The formation of an individual’s morphology during the embryonic and fetal stages.

2. Evolutionary time:

The persistence of these traits in populations across generations.

The Mental Somersault Hypothesis primarily investigates the mechanism acting on the first process.

The second process raises the question of how these developmental changes could become heritable.

Accordingly, one of the most important future research questions for the theory is:

Under what conditions can reproducible phenotypic changes caused by the developmental environment become raw material for heritable evolutionary change?

Until this question is answered, it cannot be claimed that the Mental Somersault Hypothesis explains the entirety of human evolution.

However, the existence of this question does not weaken the theory; rather, it makes the theory researchable.

17. Conclusion

This study has reformulated the Mental Somersault Hypothesis as a possible explanation for some important features of human evolution.

The central proposition of the hypothesis is:

The emergence of vertical trunk orientation in the human lineage may have altered not only the locomotor system but also the mechanical and hydrodynamic developmental environment in which the embryo developed during gestation.

This change may be modeled as follows:

vertical trunk orientation → altered gravitational and mechanical force fields → altered embryonic development → changes in cranial morphology → new possibilities for brain development

Erich Blechschmidt’s biodynamic approach to embryology provides a theoretical starting point for considering the role of developmental mechanical forces in morphogenesis.

The Geep study by Meinecke-Tillmann and Meinecke provides an important biological model demonstrating that the embryonic environment can be modified across species; however, the results of that experiment should not be directly transferred to a human-chimpanzee system.

Therefore, the next stage of the Mental Somersault Hypothesis should not be a human-chimpanzee gestational experiment, but rather **quantitative biomechanical and developmental biological testing.**

Using FEA, CFD, organoid systems, mechanotransduction analyses, and appropriate animal models, the central mechanical assumptions of the hypothesis can be tested.



In my view, the scientific value of the theory does not lie in having definitively explained human evolution, but in raising **measurable, testable, and falsifiable new questions**

about the role of the developmental mechanical environment in the formation of human morphology.

At this stage, the Mental Somersault Hypothesis is therefore not a conclusion but a **research program**.

Any future explanation of human evolution must consider the interaction between genetic information and the developmental environment.

References

1. Blechschmidt, E., & Gasser, R. F. (1977/2012). Biokinetics and Biodynamics of Human Differentiation: Principles and Applications. North Atlantic Books.
2. Ingber, D. E. (2006). Cellular mechanotransduction: Putting tensegrity in context. *Journal of Cell Science*, 119(8), 1461–1463.
3. Kaynak, O. (2024). The Origin of Humans: The Interspecies Embryo Transfer Theory. Sakin Kitap.
4. Meinecke-Tillmann, S., & Meinecke, B. (1984). Experimental chimaeras—Removal of reproductive barrier between sheep and goats. *Nature*, 307(5952), 637–638.
5. Zienkiewicz, O. C., Taylor, R. L., & Fox, J. E. (2014). The Finite Element Method for Fluid Dynamics. Butterworth-Heinemann.