1   Class I Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Urzyme and CP1 Modules have Distinct Genetic

2   Origins

Charles W. Carter, Jr[1], Alex Popinga[2], Remco Bouckaert[2], and Peter R. Wills[3]

[1]Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill,

Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7260

ORCID ID: /0000-0002-2653-4452

[2]Centre for Computational Evolution, University of Auckland, PB 92019, Auckland 1142, New

Zealand

ORCID ID: /0000-0001-6765-3813

[3]Department of Physics and Te Ao Marama Centre for Fundamental Inquiry, University of

Auckland, PB 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

ORCID ID: /0000-0002-2670-7624

Running Title: Mosaic Ancestry of Class I Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases

Keywords: BEAST, DensiTree, protein mosaic structure, RNA World hypothesis

Abbreviations: aaRS, aminoacyl-tRNA synthetase; CP1, Connecting peptide 1; MSA,

multiple sequence alignment; MCMC, Markov chain monte carlo

Abstract

Phylogenetic arguments that the adaptive radiation of the Class I aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases, aaRS, occurred after the genetic code had been extensively stabilized conflict with recent experimental data showing that ancestors of the two aaRS Classes arose on opposite strands of a single gene. The latter result necessarily implies that phylogenies for both Classes trace from a time when genetic coding used protein aaRS restricted to a far simpler amino acid alphabet. This conundrum resolves if transitions that increased the amino acid alphabet were achieved by accreting new genetic modules that today dominate the aaRS phylogenetic trees sufficiently to force convergence to a more recent date than the ancestral (i.e. Urzyme) modules. We test this hypothesis by showing that the Urzymes and comparably conserved structures from the Connecting Peptide 1 (CP1) insertions present in all Class I aaRS, and which now dominate the mass of contemporary aaRS, have significantly different degrees of conservation and inconsistent phylogenetic trees. This work represents the first time that i) sophisticated structure-based alignment has been used to curate multiple sequence alignments identifying what is conserved across an entire protein superfamily; ii) state-of-the-art phylogenetics has been used to search for high-resolution modularity in protein sequences; and iii) quantitative evidence has been adduced to show that different modules within a protein structure could have distinct ancestral genetic origins.

Introduction

The ancestry of the aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases, aaRS, is a quintessential chicken and egg puzzle whose detailed solutions are essential for understanding the origin of coded protein synthesis. How did reflexive protein machinery arise that could begin converting the symbolic information dormant in nucleic acid sequences of base triplets into sequences of amino acids according to a genetic coding table consistent with the Universal Genetic Code? For half a century, the dominant answer has been that RNA alone was capable of inventing coded proteins (Woese, C.R., Olsen, G.J., et al. 2000, Koonin, E.V. and Novozhilov, A.S. 2009, Koonin, E.V. 2011, Koonin, E.V. and Novozhilov, A.S. 2017).

The most important phylogenetic evidence for the RNA World hypothesis is that, although the accepted phylogenies of the Class I aaRS are rooted well before the Last Universal Common Ancestor (LUCA) (Aravind, L., Anantharaman, V., et al. 2002, Fournier, G.P., Andam, C.P., et al. 2011, Caetano-Anollés, G., Wang, M., et al. 2013, Fournier, G.P. and Alm, E.J. 2015, Katsnelson, M.I., Wolf, Y.I., et al. 2018), they appear also to have radiated after major bifurcations in the immense superfamily (Aravind, L., Anantharaman, V., et al. 2002) containing folds based on the Rossmann dinucleotide-binding fold (Buehner, M., Ford, G.C., et al. 1973). Genetic coding by protein aaRS is therefore, paradoxically, thought to have replaced a prior implementation based on ribozymal assignment catalysts.

We have advocated the opposite conclusion that protein aaRS co-evolved with the genetic code from the simplest origins via translation of Class I and II ancestors from opposite strands of the same bidirectional ancestral gene (Rodin, S.N. and Ohno, S. 1995, Carter, C.W., Jr. and Duax, W.L. 2002, Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007, Rodin, A., Rodin, S.N., et al. 2009, Li, L., Weinreb, V.,

et al. 2011, Chandrasekaran, S.N., Yardimci, G., et al. 2013, Li, L., Francklyn, C., et al. 2013,

Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al. 2014, Carter, C.W., Jr and Wills, P.R. 2018b, Carter, C.W., Jr and

Wills, P.R. 2018a, Wills, P.R. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2018), obviating the need for ribozymal

assignment catalysts. A hypothesis offered to reconcile the obvious and, we believe legitimate,

contradiction posed by the two origin scenarios is that contemporary protein structures are mosaics

composed of genetically distinct modules—some ancient and authentically related to the true

ancestral aaRS—to which more modern modules were assimilated at different points along their

phylogenetic timeline, in response to different sorts of selection pressures. Such a timeline could

undermine construction of reliable trees from full-length contemporary proteins.

In support of our view, the evolutionary history of the aaRS superfamilies has been

supplemented by extensive experimental deconstruction (Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017). Notably,

experimental (Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007, Carter, C.W., Jr. 2014, Martinez, L., Jimenez-

Rodriguez, M., et al. 2015) and bioinformatic (Chandrasekaran, S.N., Yardimci, G., et al. 2013)

evidence that the two aaRS Classes descended from opposite strands of a single bidirectional gene

assigns a much earlier ancestry to segments constrained by bidirectional coding than to other

regions of contemporary aaRS structures. The aaRS consequently represent a uniquely promising

opportunity to test the hypothesis that contemporary enzymes are mosaic structures assembled

from detectably different genetic ancestors.

Methods

Algorithmic sequence alignment requires some measure of amino acid similarity to

optimize alignments on the assumption that it is an alias for the overall function of a particular

amino acid in that position of the polymer. Any MSA is therefore only as good as the assumptions

used to establish homologous positions in different sequences (Morrison, D.A. 2018). It is a

distinct step again to assume that mutation and selection are the cause of the phylogenetic variation.

We superposed the available bacterial Class I aaRS crystal structures to free the multiple

sequence alignment from empirical substitution matrices, basing it instead on three-dimensional

structural homology. Popinga (Popinga, A. 2019) assembled a curated extension of that alignment

of Class I aaRS by extensive use of HHpred (Söding, J., Biegert, A., et al. 2005) and MODELLER

(Webb, B. and Sali, A. 2016) to thread amino acid sequences for close relatives of each 3D

structure. Because previous work (Chandrasekaran, S.N., Yardimci, G., et al. 2013) suggested that

bacterial aaRS sequences are closer to the root than those from other domains, we included only

eubacterial aaRS. The resulting MSA contained roughly 20 sequences for each of 10 Class I aaRS.

Within the constraints of the available crystal structures, it is as representative as possible of the

tree of life.

Phylogenetic trees constructed from these structure alignments confirmed that the physical

chemistry differentiating the 10 amino acids in each Class (Carter, C.W., Jr. and Wolfenden, R.

2015, Wolfenden, R., Lewis, C.A., et al. 2015, Carter, C.W., Jr. and Wolfenden, R. 2016) underlies

both the aaRS phylogenies and the amino acid substitution matrices generally used to build such

trees (Shore, J., Holland, B.R., et al. 2019). Exclusive use of strict structural homology circumvents

as many problems as possible in aligning sequences that diverged to produce different substrate

specificities in the pre-LUCA æon. Thus, the MSA is as independent as possible of arbitrary amino

acid substitution matrices.

The full MSA in this work was assembled from the superposed crystal and threaded 3D

structures by eliminating all non-conserved structures and connecting loops, which have different

lengths in aaRS for different amino acids, leaving the strictly-conserved secondary structures,

which we refer to as the Class I scaffold (Wills, P.R. 2014). The idiosyncratic Class I anticodon-

binding domains cannot be structurally superimposed. Despite limited regions of homology,

Motifs in CP1 outside the scaffold, and the second connecting peptide in the largest subclass IA

ValRS, LeuRS, and IleRS are only slightly less idiosyncratic. As noted in detail further on,

evidence that these the Class I scaffold motifs are genetically homologous is substantially stronger

than for the remaining variable parts of the Class I superfamily, ensuring a focus on sequences

with the strongest evidence of divergent evolution and the most confident phylogenies.

The MSA for the Class I scaffold was output using VMD (Humphrey, W., Dalke, A., et al.

1996), and is provided in the supplement together with all subsets used in this work. The scaffold

fasta file was then partitioned along lines of the experimental deconstruction of the Class I aaRS

superfamily (Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017) into the disjointed segments of the Urzyme, separated by

structurally conserved segments from the variable length insertion called Connecting Peptide 1

(CP1 (Burbaum, J. and Schimmel, P. 1991); Fig. 1). Finally, because the Urzyme (83) and CP1

(20) MSAs have different numbers of amino acids, seven 20-amino acid subsets distributed

throughout the Urzyme were selected by a balanced, randomized procedure (Carter, C.W., Jr. and

Carter, C.W. 1979) to test the effect of sequence length on our phylogenetic metrics.

We describe a two-dimensional comparison of complementary metrics of the three

different partitions—protozyme, the full Class I Urzyme, and CP1—of the overall MSA. The

conservation quality, Q_j, computed by Clustal (Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G., et al. 1994) from

amino acids filling a single sequence position in different structural homologs. When averaged

over all positions within a partition of the MSA, the resulting average, $\langle Q \rangle$ gives a position-by-

position metric of sequence variation down each column. The mean phylogenetic support, $\langle S \rangle$, in

contrast, is a metric derived from row-by-row comparison with phylogenetic trees derived across

the entire sequence length.

Molecular kinships between rows in each partition were then compared by clustering the

sequences into clades. Phylogenetic trees were computed using BEAST (Bouckaert, R., Vaughan,

T.G., et al. 2019), according to multiple amino acid substitution matrices (primarily WAG and

LG) for structurally aligned residues after deleting indels from the MSAs. Trees were visualized

with DensiTree (Bouckaert, R.R. 2010) and FigTree (Rambaut, A. 2010). For the intact Class I

scaffold and all partial alignments, DensiTree was used to extract the estimated support for clades

for each amino acid generated from ~10,000 trees sampled by Markov Chain Monte Carlo

(MCMC) simulation. For each aaRS, this support is the percentage of all trees for which the tips

descend from the same most recent common ancestor with no descendants leading to a different

aaRS type, i.e. for which that aaRS appears to be monophyletic.

Columns were appended for various predictors as noted in the text to the table of $\langle Q \rangle$ and

$\langle S \rangle$ values to form the design matrix (Table II) used for multiple regression analysis with the JMP

software (SAS 2015). Multiple Regression was used to assess the statistical strength of

contributions to conservation metric and the mean support of the predictors (i.e., the five

independent variables, A, B, C, CP1 and the number of amino acids) using stepwise searches to

identify the best set of predictors followed by least squares analysis.

Results

Deep ancestral aaRS phylogenies are better characterized, structurally and

experimentally, than those of any other protein superfamilies.

Previous phylogenetic analyses of the Class I aaRS superfamily (Wolf, Y.I., Aravind, L.,

et al. 1999, Aravind, L., Anantharaman, V., et al. 2002, Leipe, D.D., Wolf, Y.I., et al. 2002,

O'Donoghue, P. and Luthey-Schulten, Z. 2003, Roach, J.M., Sharma, S., et al. 2005, Caetano-

Anollés, G., Wang, M., et al. 2013, Shore, J., Holland, B.R., et al. 2019) generally agree that the

clades for each amino acid are monophyletic, and that the ten families fall into three subclasses

(Carter, C.W., Jr. 1993, Cusack, S. 1995), including IleRS, ValRS, LeuRS, and MetRS (Subclass

IA); GluRS and GlnRS (Subclass IB); and TyrRS and TrpRS (Subclass IC). As we restrict this

analysis to the bacterial aaRS, we exclude the archaeal Class I LysRS, which by consensus belong

to Subclass IB. There is also consensus that the remaining CysRS and ArgRS families, which were

assigned originally to Subclass IA (Cusack, S. 1995), are difficult to assign, sometimes appearing

independently, with one or the other appearing instead with Subclass IB (for example, see Roach,

J.M., Sharma, S., et al. 2005).

We test the hypothesis that Class I aaRS catalytic domains contain multiple segments with

distinct genetic origins (Fig. 1). Genetic deconstruction of Class I aaRS modules (Carter, C.W., Jr.

2014) revealed that both aaRS Classes contain a small core whose ~120-130 amino acids comprise

little more than an intact active site. Those constructs retain a major fraction of full-length aaRS

catalytic proficiency—estimated as the transition-state stabilization free energy—for both amino

acid and tRNA substrates (Pham, Y., Kuhlman, B., et al. 2010, Li, L., Weinreb, V., et al. 2011, Li,

L., Francklyn, C., et al. 2013). Because of this high catalytic proficiency, these cores were called

"Urzymes", from the German prefix "Ur" = original, authentic. Class I and II Urzymes retain the

ability to distinguish between amino acids from the two sets of substrates, Class I Urzymes

activating Class I amino acids in preference to Class II amino acids by ~1.0 kcal/mole, and

conversely (Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al. 2014, Carter, C.W., Jr 2015).

Even smaller subsets of 46 amino acids from both Class I and II retain nearly half of the

catalytic proficiency in the critical amino-acid activation reaction (Martinez, L., Jimenez-

Rodriguez, M., et al. 2015). These modules were called "protozymes", from the Greek πρoτo =

first, to distinguish them from Urzymes. Fully active Class I and II protozymes were expressed

from opposite strands of a single gene designed to encode their structures on opposite strands.

Experimental Michaelis-Menten parameters of all four protozymes—Class I and II; native and

bidirectional—are the same, within experimental error (Martinez, L., Jimenez-Rodriguez, M., et

al. 2015). The Class I protozyme coincides with the N-terminal crossover connection of the

Rossmann fold, which contains a distinctive 3D packing motif that recurs in ~25% of the proteome

(Cammer, S. and Carter, C.W., Jr. 2010) and imposes distinct, functionally relevant

conformational states tightly coupled to catalysis in TrpRS (Weinreb, V., Li, L., et al. 2012, Li, L.

and Carter, C.W., Jr 2013, Weinreb, V., Li, L., et al. 2014, Carter, C.W., Jr. 2019).

The progressive biochemical functionality of aaRS protozymes, Urzymes, and catalytic

domains; the fact that their structures represent universally conserved portions within both

families; and the strong evidence that they descended from a single bidirectional ancestral gene all

imply that they are legitimate experimental models for ancestral evolutionary intermediates.

Moreover, to date, such sequential models have been derived solely for the two aaRS

superfamilies. Evidence that their essential catalytic architectures arose from a bidirectional gene

implies, *ipso facto*, that sequences inconsistent with bidirectional coding represent accretion of

new genetic material. Thus, more is known about the modular evolution of the two aaRS

superfamilies than for any other such superfamily. Those data, in turn, predict quantitative

differences between MSAs for modules derived from different sources.

The variable CP1 insertion (Burbaum, J.J., Starzyk, R.M., et al. 1990, Burbaum, J.J. and

Schimmel, P. 1991) divides the Class I signature Rossmann dinucleotide binding fold into roughly

equal parts, always intersecting the Rossmann fold between residues ~4.5 Å apart, so that it can

be replaced without structural disruption with a single peptide bond to produce the Class I Urzyme

(Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007). CP1 insertions include the large editing domains of the aaRS for

aliphatic amino acids, and are thus responsible for the variable lengths of Class I aaRS catalytic

domains. As the CP1 insertion is incompatible with bidirectional genetic coding of ancestral Class

I and II aaRS (Fig. 1B), its introduction would necessarily have ended bidirectional coding of Class

I and II aaRS. For that reason alone, it is worthwhile to examine, quantitatively, the phylogenetic

relationships between the Class I protozyme, Urzyme, and CP1 sequences.

Structural homology across the entire Class I superfamily extends beyond the Urzyme.

Independent 3D superposition of aaRS crystal structures (Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007,

Wills, P.R. 2014) revealed considerable structural conservation within the catalytic domains of all

ten members of each Class—see Fig. 1 of (Wills, P.R. 2014). We call this structurally conserved

core the Class I scaffold. The Class I Urzyme boundaries delimited decisively by bidirectional

coding of Class II Urzymes constitute only about 80% of this scaffold; the remainder consists of

20 σ-helical residues in roughly equal segments close to each end of the CP1 insertion.

Class I CP1 sequences are significantly less well-conserved than Urzyme sequences.

Position-by-position conservation in comparably conserved structures from the Class I

scaffold is significantly higher in sequences within the Urzyme than in CP1 (Fig. 2 and Table 1).

The $\langle Q \rangle$ for the CP1segment is smaller by 3-6 times than the standard error of the mean. To assess

the significance, we estimated the regression model $\langle Q \rangle_{calc}$ = Constant + β*[CP1], where [CP1]

= 1 if and only if the position is within the CP1 segment and 0 otherwise. This model was selected

from a stepwise regression testing effects of all four segments, together with their two-way

interactions. It was the only legitimate model. Statistics for the model are given in Table I; the β-

coefficient for [CP1] is negative and its P-value is 1.3E-5. Columns of the MSA derived from CP1

therefore are significantly less well-conserved than those derived from the Uryzme.

Class I Urzyme- and CP1-based trees form distinctly different clades.

Urzyme and CP1 partitions of the MSAs produce quite different trees (Fig. 3). In particular,

although all ten Class I aaRS clades are monophyletic in the Urzyme trees, three clades in the CP1

trees—MetRS, ValRS, and TyrRS—are not monophyletic. Moreover, the Urzyme clades are

constrained by tight envelopes, whereas the CP1 clades have poorly defined envelopes. Thus,

although the 3D structures from which the two partitions were derived are apparently equally

homologous, the phylogenetic behaviors of their amino acid sequences differ markedly.

Support, S_i, the fraction of all trees for which each aaRS clade, i, is monophyletic, was

averaged over all Class I aaRS types to give the mean support, $\langle S \rangle = \sum S_i / 10$. That analytical

operation was repeated for trees built for the full scaffold sequence alignment, (Full), the Urzyme,

CP1, protozyme (fragment A in Fig. 1), and seven subsets consisting of twenty amino acids in

blocks of five residues as described in Methods. Data for these eleven rows of the design matrix

(Table II) were evaluated using the conventional WAG (Whelan, S. and Goldman, N. 2001)

substitution matrix and repeated using the more recent LG (Pokarowski, P., Kloczkowski, A., et

al. 2007) substitution matrix used in (Shore, J., Holland, B.R., et al. 2019).

Contributors to the variance of $\langle S \rangle$ were assessed using stepwise multiple regression,

which resulted in a single model, summarized in Figure 4 and Table III. The optimal regression

model was: $\langle S \rangle = 0.63 + 0.06 * A - 0.07 * CP1 + 0.05 * A * CP1$. All three coefficients are

significant at better than the 99% confidence level, with P-values < 0.00001. As suggested by its

position in the regression curve in Figure 4, trees built from CP1 residues have significantly less

support than those from the Urzyme. Residues from the protozyme contribute more positively to

the average support than those derived from elsewhere in the Urzyme. Notably, the number of

residues in a given block from the MSA has no detectable effect on either $\langle Q \rangle$ or $\langle S \rangle$.

Discussion

Roots of the two aaRS superfamilies are likely deeper than for all or most other protein

superfamilies (Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017), so they present a unique challenge. Results presented here

open a new window on deep protein phylogenetics (Gaucher, E.A., Kratzer, J.T., et al. 2010),

addressing questions that have been previously recognized (Trifonov, E.N. 1995, Sobolevsky, Y.,

Frenkel, Z.M., et al. 2007) but until now never quantitatively addressed. We are motivated here by

a desire to clarify the ancestry of Class I aaRS and especially the argument that they branched from

related parts of the proteome late, relative to the formulation of the genetic coding table. That

contention (Koonin, E.V. and Novozhilov, A.S. 2009, Koonin, E.V. and Novozhilov, A.S. 2017)

is crucial to understanding the origin of coding, because it represents the strongest, and perhaps

the only, phylogenetic evidence favoring the RNA World hypothesis.

Our long-range goal is to understand the evolution of aaRS•tRNA cognate pairs and thence

the order of addition of entries in the Universal genetic coding table. Construction of trees for aaRS

using any amino acid substitution matrix is necessarily fundamentally ambiguous, because at each

node in any conceivable tree, the coding alphabet and dimension of the operational substitution

matrix necessarily both change by integer steps, starting from 2 and ending at 20 as the Class I and

II trees branch into multiple families. Thus, if different motifs within a protein have different

evolutionary histories, it is uncertain—in the absence of a broader experimental and structural

context—what should be inferred either from a lack of tight congruence or the presence of strong

congruence of the branching pattern.

These difficulties are significantly offset by the extensive data assembled from the

construction and experimental characterization of aaRS protozymes (Martinez, L., Jimenez-

Rodriguez, M., et al. 2015) and Urzymes (Li, L. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2013, Li, L., Francklyn, C.,

et al. 2013, Carter, C.W., Jr. 2014, Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al. 2014, Weinreb, V., Li, L., et al.

2014, Carter, C.W., Jr 2015, Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017). The quantitative, parallel increases in activity

with comparable additions of mass (Martinez, L., Jimenez-Rodriguez, M., et al. 2015) together

with the phylogenetic evidence for bidirectional coding ancestry (Chandrasekaran, S.N., Yardimci,

G., et al. 2013) establish these constructs as legitimate evolutionary intermediates. Such

intermediates are manifestly unique to the aaRS at present. Substantially more data therefore

constrain their deep ancestry than for any other protein superfamilies (Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017).

Threading does not force any particular comparison between different aaRS types.

Threading added additional sequences, increasing the reliability of structure-based

alignments within any aaRS type. Scaffold positions were rigorously defined as structural

homologs, judged by the close proximity of their alpha carbon coordinates in the X-ray PDB

multiple structure alignments (i) among aaRS for any single amino acid, drawn from very diverse

bacterial species, that then (ii) produce a grand scaffold MSA across all Class I aaRS types.

Importantly, additions produced by threading thus have only second-order effects on structural

superpositions of aaRS for different amino acids. Threading thus adds precision to our analysis

without overtly influencing choices on which our conclusions depend.

Conservation ($\langle Q \rangle$) and congruency ($\langle S \rangle$) metrics are essentially uncorrelated.

Regression of $\langle Q \rangle$ against $\langle S \rangle$ gives $R^2 = 0.37$ (P = 0.05). However, this weak correlation results

entirely from the fact that the CP1 sequences are significant outliers in both metrics. Excluding

CP1, regression gives $R^2 = 0.0$ (P = 0.85). The two metrics—conservation down columns and

kinship between rows—are uncorrelated metrics, strengthening the implication that CP1

sequences are drawn from a different population.

Distinguishing features of CP1 sequences are evident without considering indels.

Figures. 2-4 and Tables I-III together illustrate a near-optimal quantitative, comprehensive

two-dimensional comparison of the sequence data. The crux of what these data tell us is that,

despite substantial prior evidence that CP1 is more recent than the Urzyme, its evolutionary

divergence—evidenced by $\langle Q \rangle$—is much greater, and its phylogenetic consistency—evidenced

by $\langle S \rangle$—is much reduced, relative to are much greater than the corresponding metrics for Urzyme

segments. It seems not to matter whether the scaffold for a new aaRS type is produced from its

parent structure by strict mutation-only or also includes indel processes.

The success of the mutation-only model to account for the functional expansion of the

aaRSs in parallel with the expansion of the alphabet (in contrast to the CP1 development)

underscores the adequacy of that model in corroborating the hypothesis that CP1 has quite different

properties that likely imply a distinct evolutionary history. That this conclusion is so evident, even

when considering only sequences with strict 1-1 correspondences between 3D crystal structures,

and excluding the large and variable-length indels that account for bulk of CP1 in most aaRS types,

and their consensus role in enhancing fidelity (Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017), emphasizes its importance.

Urzyme and CP1 sequences exhibit statistically different properties.

By both metrics, Urzyme-derived amino acid sequences—i.e. those that are consistent with

bidirectional coding ancestry—differ, statistically, from those derived from comparably conserved

segments within CP1. These new data suggest that Urzyme and CP1 sequences have distinct

evolutionary histories. The log-worth values (i.e., -log(P)) for loss of conservation and lack of

congruence for phylogenetic trees are 4.9 and 7.7, implying very high statistical significance that

the respective metrics for CP1 and Urzyme sequences are drawn from different populations. The

numbers of residues in different segments drawn from the MSA have no detectable impact on the

$\langle S \rangle$ score, implying that they have an insignificant impact on its variance.

If the subsets of Class I aaRS sequences we examine here were all drawn from continuously

replicated ancient genetic sources, subject to comparable selection history since their emergence,

the null hypotheses for our analyses would produce similar trees and similarly conserved

sequences for the Urzyme and CP1 partitions. By showing that both position-by-position and row-

by-row analyses of the Urzyme and CP1 partitions of the Class I scaffold MSA produce

significantly different statistical metrics, we corroborate the hypothesis—based on bidirectional

coding ancestry—that the CP1 sequences derive from a more recent acquisition of genetic

information than the Urzyme. Moreover, and by a similar argument, the data are also consistent

with the hypothesis that protozyme sequences (segment A) were, themselves, drawn from a

distinct, perhaps even earlier population, as previously proposed (Carter, C.W., Jr and Wills, P.R.

2018b).

Neither convergent evolution nor horizontal gene transfer are likely explanations for the

Urzyme/CP1 distinction.

The congruent clade structure of Urzyme-derived sequences from the scaffold fall into

consensus groupings characterizing Class I aaRS as a coherent superfamily and does not require

mechanisms beyond mutation and selection from a single common ancestor. The aberrant behavior

of sequence variations in the CP1 insertion (Figs. 2-4) does, however, appear to require appeal to

such processes. Treatments of Class I aaRS evolution based on full MSAs (Wolf, Y.I., Aravind,

L., et al. 1999, Shiba, K. 2005, Soucy, S.M., Huang, J., et al. 2015) show evidence of horizontal

gene transfer (HGT), genetic transpositions and large scale insertion/deletion events, of which CP1

is the foremost example. Wherever full-length bacterial Class I enzymes with a particular amino

acid substrate specificity are represented by more than one canonical structure, as has been

described for IleRS and MetRS (see Fig. 3 in Shiba, K. 2005), that bipartite distribution in genome

space is adequately explained in terms of early HGT into bacteria from an archaean/eukaryotic

ancestor, but not in terms of convergent evolution. CP1 sequence disparities at homologous

sequence positions in TyrRS, MetRS, and ValRS behave in an opposite manner: the higher

variance of their $\langle Q \rangle$ values producing lower $\langle S \rangle$ values by allowing their evolutionary paths to

wander widely, often crossing in sequence space, instead of forming multiple well-defined clades

reasonably distant from one another in sequence space that would suggest HGT.

Descent of Class I and II aaRS from a single bidirectional ancestral gene (Rodin, S.N. and

Ohno, S. 1995, Rodin, A., Rodin, S.N., et al. 2009, Chandrasekaran, S.N., Yardimci, G., et al.

2013, Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al. 2014, Carter, C.W., Jr 2015, Martinez, L., Jimenez-Rodriguez,

M., et al. 2015, Carter, C.W., Jr. 2017) together with the notion (Carter, C.W., Jr and Wills, P.R.

2018b, Wills, P.R. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2018, Carter, C.W., Jr. and Wills, P.R. 2020) that the

genetic coding table evolved as pre-existing aaRS genes bifurcated to produce related aaRS whose

tRNA and amino acid specificities diverged to enable the daughter synthetases to differentiate

between amino acids in groups that previously had functioned as synonymous underscore the

likelihood that the aaRS of both families diverged, rather than converging to similar functions from

different sources.

The discrepancy between CP1 and Urzyme evolutionary metrics is likely to have originated

because CP1 is of later origin. Its insertion into members of the quasi-species distributions of

different aaRS types perhaps relied on idiosyncratic features of receptive variants. The subsequent

coevolution of CP1 and Urzyme sequences would have necessarily preserved Urzyme

functionality, while the new CP1 could adapt flexibly to its developing role in different ways

according to the extant context of the Urzyme's functional mode as we describe in the final section,

fixing the apparent orthologs in different ways that may be related to HGT.

Primordial aaRS were quasispecies that covered progressively smaller regions of sequence

space, the further back in time toward the "root".

AARS evolution cannot have been an ordinary mutation/selection process. All solutions to

the problem normally framed as the "chicken and egg problem"(Tyson, N.d. 2013) imply a

continuity principal: at any stage during the emergence of coding, some prior system must have

been interpreted extant protogenes. A key aspect of such prior systems is that as the alphabet size,

diversity, and consequent fidelity increased, they would, *ipso facto*, have created more narrowly

targeted selection pressures, strongly coupling mutation and selection in early stages of genetic

coding (Fig. 5). Their behaviors would have depended on the relationship between the shapes of

fitness landscapes and error rates of catalysis by the extant quasispecies (Lauring, A.S. and

Andino, R. 2010). The earliest alphabets, including at least the first two amino acid types, were

also tightly coupled by the additional constraint of bidirectional coding (gray shaded background,

Figure 5). These characteristics are, of course, the fundamental unknowns we wish, ultimately, to

infer, underscoring the primary importance of this work.

We have argued (Carter, C.W., Jr and Wills, P.R. 2018b, Wills, P.R. and Carter, C.W., Jr

2018) that in that historical context a single functional island in sequence space (i.e. quasispecies)

would invariably have been a strong attractor, irrespective of the detailed shape of the fitness

landscape that stabilized it, in that all mutations would move the system slightly off its optimum

phenotype but then be subject to strongly restorative selection pressures. On the other hand, if

ancestral protozymes from a bidirectional gene had broad, relatively flat (and necessarily

codependent) fitness landscapes, matched to the correspondingly high error rates, that could have

favored the emergence of bifurcated quasispecies that enhanced genetic coding by recruiting new

amino acid types and simultaneously increasing the precision with which child specificities could

be encoded (Fig. 5).

High-resolution structural modularity is consistent with functionally significant

discontinuities in the evolution of genetic coding.

387   The shortest CP1 insertions have ~75 residues in TrpRS and TyrRS. That segment recurs

essentially intact in the longer CP1 insertions present in the remaining eight Class I aaRS (Pham,

Y., Li, L., et al. 2007, Wills, P.R. 2014). It appears to be required to form an annulus around the

Urzyme (Fig. 1A,C), so it seems likely that the initial insertion was that long. For that reason the

original hypothesis as to its origin (Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007) was that it resulted from the

essentially simultaneous insertion of some form of mobile genetic element in all extant Class I

Urzymes, in which case its actual root sequence would have been both more recent than that of the

Urzymes, and earlier than the earliest contemporary full-length aaRS enzymes. That, alone, could

generate distinctive behavior of CP1 segments in the scaffold MSA.

396   Different background colors in Figure 5 denote how branching of the tree to allow

introduction of the nth amino acid into the alphabet enables a highly cooperative re-optimizing of

the n-1 aaRS types functions already present. As each new, refined amino acid type emerges, all

extant gene sequences adapt to opportunities introduced by progressively finer discrimination

between amino acid side chain physical chemistry. In turn, adaptation to a more diverse alphabet

sharpens the new aaRS fidelities (i.e., the contraction of branch thicknesses. That cooperativity

creates a Lamarckian correlation between selection pressure and its outcome—the result of any

mutation being nearly synonymous with the selection pressure it faced, especially at the beginning

of the differentiation of the code.

Insertion of the CP1 motif necessarily ended bidirectional coding, thus dividing aaRS

evolutionary histories qualitatively into distinct phases (between green and yellow backgrounds).

A variety of evidence supports the notion that the chief selective advantage represented by the CP1

insertion might have been to transcend the fundamental limitation on specificity posed by the

Urzyme architecture, allowing substantial increases in the fidelity of the assignment catalysts.

Amino acid specificities of Class I and II Urzymes (Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al. 2014, Carter,

C.W., Jr 2015) suggest that even these highly evolved assignment catalysts could activate an amino

acid from the correct amino acid Class only 80% of the time, or four times out of five. Urzyme

constructs capable of 10^9-fold rate accelerations nonetheless had quite modest fidelity and had

only just begun the ascent to 99.99% specificity. In turn, this suggests a fundamental limitation to

the precision of which bidirectional coding was ultimately capable.

The most obvious contribution of CP1 to fidelity is that the editing domains present in the

larger subclass IA aaRS for aliphatic amino acids Ile, Val, and Leu are all elaborations of the CP1

motif present in the simplest subclass IC aaRS for Tyr and Trp. Such a function may, however,

have developed from the annulus that CP1 forms around two parts of the Urzyme (Fig. 6),

constraining the size and shape of the amino acid binding pocket. Several groups have been unable

to change specificities of subclass IB Glu vs Gln (Bullock, T., Uter, N., et al. 2003, Perona, J.J.

and Gruic-Sovulj, I. 2013) or subclass IC Trp vs Tyr (Sever, S., Rogers, K., et al. 1996) via

comprehensive mutation of side chains in the immediate vicinity of the amino acid substrate, all

of which are within the Urzyme architecture. In the former work (Bullock, T., Uter, N., et al. 2003),

the authors could not alter specificity without making wholesale mutations outside the Urzyme

and within the CP1 domain that form the second boundary layer of the amino acid binding site.

Following up the latter work (Sever, S., Rogers, K., et al. 1996), a modular thermodynamic

cycle consisting of full-length TrpRS, the Urzyme and the Urzyme plus either CP1 or the anticodon

binding domain (ABD) showed that rejection of Tyrosine and selection of the indole side chain of

tryptophan by *G. stearothermophilus* TrpRS requires cooperation between CP1 and the ABD (Li,

L. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2013, Weinreb, V., Li, L., et al. 2014). CP1 must coordinate its movements

with those of the ABD to perform the allosteric communication necessary to enhance side chain

selectivity beyond the modest capabilities of the Urzyme. In other words, bidirectional coding

likely limited Urzyme specificity. Fine tuning specific recognition of amino acid substrates

required insertion of CP1 and the ABD, which in turn dramatically transformed the Class I aaRS

fitness landscape.

Figure 7 summarizes in color several important stages in the development of genetic coding

we have identified here that were inaccessible prior to our work on evolutionary intermediates.

These stages complement—without necessarily contradicting—the work of Koonin (Koonin, E.V.

2011). Importantly, our results support a plausible alternative to the late radiation of assignment

catalysts, by breaking code development into steps we can document. The events on which we

hope to shed new light lie far deeper in time than all or most other phylogenetic analyses, and yet

pose among the most fundamental and challenging questions. That both metrics lend support to,

and help make sense of, a substantial body of experimental data relevant to Class I aaRS evolution

validates this effort.

Acknowledgments. This work was supported by NIGMS R01-78227. We are grateful to Corbin

Jones and Greg Fournier for helpful feedback in preparing the manuscript and Loren Williams for

suggesting that ribosomal protein sequences exhibit a similar genetic mosaicity.

References

Aravind L, Anantharaman V, Koonin EV. 2002. Monophyly of Class I Aminoacyl

tRNASynthetase, USPA, ETFP, Photolyase, and PP-ATPase Nucleotide-Binding Domains:

Implication for Protein Evolution in the RNAWorld. PROTEINS: Struct. Funct. Gen., 48:1–14.

Bouckaert R, Vaughan TG, Sottani JB, Duchene S, Fourment M, Gavryushkina A, Heled

J, Jones G, Kühnert D, De Maio N, *et al.* 2019. BEAST 2.5: An Advanced Software Platform for

Bayesian Evolutionary Analysis. PLoS Comput Biol, In Press.

Bouckaert RR. 2010. DensiTree: making sense of sets of phylogenetic trees.

BIOINFORMATICS, 26 1372–1373.

Buehner M, Ford GC, Moras D, Olsen KW, Rossmann MG. 1973. D-Glyceraldehyde 3-

Phosphate Dehydrogenase: Three Dimensional Structure and Evolutionary Significance. Proc.

Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 70:3052-3054.

Bullock T, Uter N, Nissan TA, Perona JJ. 2003. Amino Acid Discrimination by a class I

aminoacyl-tRNA synthetase specified by negative determinants. J. Mol. Biol., 328:395-408.

Burbaum J, Schimmel P. 1991. Structural Relationships and the Classification of

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases. The Journal of Biological Chemistry, 266:16965-16968.

Burbaum JJ, Schimmel P. 1991. Assembly of a Class I tRNA Synthetase from Products

of an Artificially Split Gene. Biochem., 30:319-324.

Burbaum JJ, Starzyk RM, Schimmel P. 1990. Understanding Structural Relationships in

Proteins of Unsolved Three-Dimensional Structure. PROTEINS: Struct. Funct. Gen., 7:99-111.

Caetano-Anollés G, Wang M, Caetano-Anollés D. 2013. Structural Phylogenomics

Retrodicts the Origin of the Genetic Code and Uncovers the Evolutionary Impact of Protein

Flexibility. Plos One, 8:e72225.

Cammer S, Carter CW, Jr. 2010. Six Rossmannoid Folds, Including the Class I

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases, Share a Partial Core with the Anticodon-Binding Domain of a

Class II Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase. Bioinformatics, 26:709-714.

Carter CW, Jr. 2015. What RNA World? Why a Peptide/RNA Partnership Merits

Renewed Experimental Attention. Life, 5:294-320.

Carter CW, Jr, Wills PR. 2018a. Did Gene Expression Co-evolve with Gene Replication?

In: Pontarotti P editor. Evolutionary Biology: Genome and Phenotype Evolution. Paris,

Springer-Nature p. 293-313.

Carter CW, Jr, Wills PR. 2018b. Interdependence, Reflexivity, Fidelity, and Impedance

Matching, and the Evolution of Genetic Coding. Molecular Biology and Evolution, 35:269-286.

Carter CW, Jr. 1993. Cognition, Mechanism, and Evolutionary Relationships in

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases. Ann. Rev. Biochem., 62:715-748.

Carter CW, Jr. 2014. Urzymology: Experimental Access to a Key Transition in the

Appearance of Enzymes. J. Biol. Chem., 289:30213–30220.

Carter CW, Jr. 2017. Coding of Class I and II aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases. Advances in

Experimental Medicine and Biology: Protein Reviews, 18:103-148.

Carter CW, Jr. 2019. Escapement mechanisms: efficient free energy transduction by

reciprocally-coupled gating. Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics, 88:forthcoming.

Carter CW, Jr., Carter CW. 1979. Protein Crystallization Using Incomplete Factorial

Experiments. Journal of Biological Chemistry, 254:12219-12223.

Carter CW, Jr., Duax WL. 2002. Did tRNA Synthetase Classes Arise on Opposite

Strands of the Same Gene? Molecular Cell, 10:705-708.

Carter CW, Jr., Li L, Weinreb V, Collier M, Gonzales-Rivera K, Jimenez-Rodriguez M,

Erdogan O, Chandrasekharan SN. 2014. The Rodin-Ohno Hypothesis That Two Enzyme

Superfamilies Descended from One Ancestral Gene: An Unlikely Scenario for the Origins of

Translation That Will Not Be Dismissed. Biology Direct, 9:11.

Carter CW, Jr., Wills PR. 2020. The Roots of Genetic Coding in Aminoacyl-tRNA

Synthetase Duality Annual Review of Biochemistry, 89; In Preparation.

Carter CW, Jr., Wolfenden R. 2015. tRNA Acceptor-Stem and Anticodon Bases Form

Independent Codes Related to Protein Folding. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 112 7489-7494.

Carter CW, Jr., Wolfenden R. 2016. Acceptor-stem and anticodon bases embed amino

acid chemistry into tRNA. RNA Biology, 13:145–151.

Carter CWJ. 1993. Cognition, Mechanism, and Evolutionary Relationships in

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases. Annual Review of Biochemistry, 62:715-748.

Chandrasekaran SN, Yardimci G, Erdogan O, Roach JM, Carter CW, Jr. 2013. Statistical

Evaluation of the Rodin-Ohno Hypothesis: Sense/Antisense Coding of Ancestral Class I and II

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases. Molecular Biology and Evolution, 30:1588-1604.

Cusack S. 1995. Eleven down and nine to go. Nat. Str. Biol., 2:824-831.

Fournier GP, Alm EJ. 2015. Ancestral Reconstruction of a Pre-LUCA Aminoacyl-tRNA

Synthetase Ancestor Supports the Late Addition of Trp to the Genetic Code. J. Mol. Evol.,

80:171-185.

Fournier GP, Andam CP, Alm EJ, Gogarten JP. 2011. Molecular Evolution of Aminoacyl

tRNA Synthetase Proteins in the Early History of Life. Orig Life Evol Biosph, 41 621–632

Gaucher EA, Kratzer JT, Randall RN. 2010. Deep Phylogeny—How a Tree Can Help

Characterize Early Life on Earth. Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol., 2:a002238.

Humphrey W, Dalke A, Schulten K. 1996. VMD - Visual Molecular Dynamics. Journal

of Molecular Graphics, 14:33-38.

Katsnelson MI, Wolf YI, Koonin EV. 2018. Towards physical principles of biological

evolution. arXiv, orgabs1709.00284.

Koonin EV. 2011. The Logic of Chance: The Nature and Origin of Biological Evolution.

Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson Education; FT Press Science.

Koonin EV, Novozhilov AS. 2009. Origin and Evolution of the Genetic Code: The

Universal Enigma. IUBMB Life, , 61:99–111.

Koonin EV, Novozhilov AS. 2017. Origin and Evolution of the Universal Genetic Code.

Annu. Rev. Genet., 51:45–62.

Lauring AS, Andino R. 2010. Quasispecies Theory and the Behavior of RNA Viruses.

PLoS Pathogens 6 e1001005.

Leipe DD, Wolf YI, Koonin EV, Aravind L. 2002. Classification and Evolution of P-loop

GTPases and Related ATPases. J. Mol. Biol., 317:41-72.

Li L, Carter CW, Jr. 2013. Full Implementation of the Genetic Code by Tryptophanyl-

tRNA Synthetase Requires Intermodular Coupling. J. Biol. Chem., 288:34736–34745.

Li L, Francklyn C, Carter CW, Jr. 2013. Aminoacylating Urzymes Challenge the RNA

World Hypothesis. J. Biol. Chem., 288:26856-26863.

Li L, Weinreb V, Francklyn C, Carter CW, Jr. 2011. Histidyl-tRNA Synthetase Urzymes:

Class I and II Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetase Urzymes have Comparable Catalytic Activities for

Cognate Amino Acid Activation. J. Biol. Chem., 286:10387-10395.

Martinez L, Jimenez-Rodriguez M, Gonzalez-Rivera K, Williams T, Li L, Weinreb V,

Chandrasekaran SN, Collier M, Ambroggio X, Kuhlman B, *et al.* 2015. Functional Class I and II

Amino Acid Activating Enzymes Can Be Coded by Opposite Strands of the Same Gene. J. Biol.

Chem., 290:19710–19725.

Morrison DA. 2018. Multiple Sequence Alignment is not a Solved Problem.

arXiv:1808.07717.

O'Donoghue P, Luthey-Schulten Z. 2003. On the Evolution of Structure in Aminoacyl-

tRNA Synthetases. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev., 67:550–573.

Perona JJ, Gruic-Sovulj I. 2013. Synthetic and Editing Mechanisms of Aminoacyl-tRNA

Synthetases. Topics in Current Chemistry DOI: 10.1007/128_2013_456.

Pham Y, Kuhlman B, Butterfoss GL, Hu H, Weinreb V, Carter CW, Jr. 2010.

Tryptophanyl-tRNA synthetase Urzyme: a model to recapitulate molecular evolution and

investigate intramolecular complementation. J. Biol. Chem., 285:38590-38601.

Pham Y, Li L, Kim A, Erdogan O, Weinreb V, Butterfoss G, Kuhlman B, Carter CW, Jr.

2007. A Minimal TrpRS Catalytic Domain Supports Sense/Antisense Ancestry of Class I and II

Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases. Mol Cell, 25:851-862.

Pokarowski P, Kloczkowski A, Nowakowski S, Pokarowska M, Jernigan RL, Kolinski A.

2007. Ideal amino acid exchange forms for approximating substitution matrices. Proteins,

69:379–393.

Popinga A. 2019. From the Origins of Life to Epidemics: Bayesian Inference, Stochastic

Simulation, and Dynamics of Bioinformatic Systems. Computer Science. Auckland, NZ,

University of Auckland: Supplementary Data. http://github.com/alexpopinga/aaRS-Pipeline,

accessed 11 April 2019.

Rambaut A. 2010. FigTree. University of Edinburgh.

Roach JM, Sharma S, Kapustina M, Carter CW, Jr. 2005. Structure alignment via

Delaunay tetrahedralization. PROTEINS: Struct. Funct. Bioinf., 60:66-81.

Rodin A, Rodin SN, Carter CW, Jr. 2009. On Primordial Sense-Antisense Coding.

Journal of Molecular Evolution, 69:555-567.

Rodin SN, Ohno S. 1995. Two Types of Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases Could be

Originally Encoded by Complementary Strands of the Same Nucleic Acid. Orig. Life Evol.

Biosph., 25:565-589.

SAS. 2015. JMP: The Statistical Discovery Software. Cary, NC, SAS Institute, Cary NC.

Sever S, Rogers K, Rogers MJ, Carter CW, Jr., Söll D. 1996. *Escherichia coli*

tryptophanyl-tRNA synthetase mutants selected for tryptophan auxotrophy implicate the dimer

interface in optimizing amino acid binding. Biochemistry, 35:32-40.

Shiba K. 2005. Glycyl-tRNA Synthetases. In: Ibba M, Francklyn C, Cusack S editors.

The Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases Austin, Landes Bioscience.

Shore J, Holland BR, Sumner JG, Nieselt K, Wills PR. 2019. The Ancient Operational

Code is Embedded in the Amino Acid Substitution Matrix and aaRS Phylogenies. J. Mol. Evol.,

88:136–150.

Sobolevsky Y, Frenkel ZM, Trifonov EN. 2007. Combinations of Ancestral Modules in

Proteins. J. Mol. Evol. , 65:640–650.

Söding J, Biegert A, Lupas AN. 2005. The HHpred interactive server for protein

homology detection and structure prediction. Nucl. Acids Res., 33:W244–W248

Soucy SM, Huang J, Gogarten JP. 2015. Horizontal gene transfer: building the web of

life. Nat. Rev. Gen., 16:472

Thompson JD, Higgins DG, Gibson TJ. 1994. Clustal W: improving the sensitivity of

progressive multiple sequence alignment through sequence weighting, positions-specific gap

penalties and weight matrix choice. Nucleic Acids Res., 22:4673-4680.

Trifonov EN. 1995. Segmented Structure of Protein Sequences and Early Evolution of

Genome by Combinatorial Fusion of DNA Elements. J. Mol, Evol. , 40:337-342.

Tyson Nd. 2013. "Just to settle it once and for all: Which came first the Chicken or the

Egg? The Egg – laid by a bird that was not a Chicken. 2013-01-28:Tweet.

Webb B, Sali A. 2016. Comparative Protein Structure Modeling Using Modeller. Current

Protocols in Bioinformatics, John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,, p. 5.6.1-5.6.37.

Weinreb V, Li L, Carter CW, Jr. 2012. A Master Switch Couples Mg^{2+}-Assisted

Catalysis to Domain Motion in B. stearothermophilus Tryptophanyl-tRNA Synthetase. Structure,

20:128-138.

Weinreb V, Li L, Chandrasekaran SN, Koehl P, Delarue M, Carter CW, Jr 2014.

Enhanced Amino Acid Selection in Fully-Evolved Tryptophanyl-tRNA Synthetase, Relative to

its Urzyme, Requires Domain Movement Sensed by the D1 Switch, a Remote, Dynamic Packing

Motif J Biol Chem 289:4367-4376.

Whelan S, Goldman N. 2001. A General Empirical Model of Protein Evolution Derived

from Multiple Protein Families Using a Maximum-Likelihood Approach. Molecular Biology and

Evolution, 18:691-699.

Wills PR. 2014. Genetic Information, Physical Interpreters and Thermodynamics; The

Material-Informatic Basis of Biosemiosis Biosemiotics 7:141–165.

Wills PR, Carter CW, Jr. 2018. Insuperable problems of an initial genetic code emerging

from an RNA World. BioSystems, 164:155-166.

Woese CR, Olsen GJ, Ibba M, Soll D. 2000. Aminoacyl-tRNA Synthetases, the Genetic

Code, and the Evolutionary Process. Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev., 64:202–236.

Wolf YI, Aravind L, Grishin NV, Koonin EV. 1999. Evolution of Aminoacyl-tRNA

Synthetases—Analysis of Unique Domain Architectures and Phylogenetic Trees Reveals a

Complex History of Horizontal Gene Transfer Events. Genome Research, 9:689–710.

Wolfenden R, Lewis CA, Yuan Y, Carter CW, Jr. 2015. Temperature dependence of

amino acid hydrophobicities. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA, 112 7484-7488.

Table I. Regression model for $\langle Q \rangle_{calc}$ as a function of inclusion in CP1. R^2 for this model is 0.17

for the 104 columns in the MSA. Regression using the (alternate) design matrix in Table II yields

a similar result, for which $R^2 = 0.32$ with $P = 0.007$.

Term	β	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob>|t|
Intercept	52.45	1.80	29.22	<.0001
CP1	-18.77	4.09	-4.59	1.3 E-5

Table II. Design matrix for regression analysis. $\langle Q \rangle$ is the mean Conservation Quality averaged

over a given partition of the MSA. $\langle S \rangle$ is the mean support value for all ten amino acids defined

in Methods from clade congruencies. A, B, C, and CP1 are independent variables, defined from

the proportional representation of residues (approximately as multiples of 10) in each of the

segments for each row, in accordance with Figure 1C. LG encodes which amino acid substitution

matrix, LG (1) or WAG (0), was used to construct trees. NUMB is the number of amino acids in

the alignment.

Subset	$\langle S \rangle$	$\langle Q \rangle$	A	B	C	CP1	LG	NUMB
Full	0.90	48.8	4	4	1	2	0	103
Urzyme	0.87	52.4	4	4	1	0	0	83
Protoz	0.85	52.3	4	0	0	0	0	46
CP1	0.34	33.7	0	0	0	2	0	20
Urz_0	0.76	50.1	1	1	0	0	0	20
Urz_1	0.71	57.8	0	1	0.5	0	0	20
Urz_2	0.72	55.0	2	0	0	0	0	20
Urz_3	0.62	45.6	0	4	0	0	0	20
Urz_4	0.82	58.5	2	1	0.5	0	0	20
Urz_5	0.78	45.6	4	0	0	0	0	20
Urz_6	0.62	56.6	0	2	1	0	0	20
Full	0.86	na	4	4	1	2	1	103
Urzyme	0.82	na	4	4	1	0	1	83
Protoz	0.85	na	4	0	0	0	1	46

CP1	0.35	na	0	0	0	2	1	20
Urz_0	0.73	na	1	1	0	0	1	20
Urz_1	0.68	na	0	1	0.5	0	1	20
Urz_2	0.70	na	2	0	0	0	1	20
Urz_3	0.62	na	0	4	0	0	1	20
Urz_4	0.77	na	2	1	0.5	0	1	20
Urz_5	0.80	na	4	0	0	0	1	20
Urz_6	nd	na	0	2	1	0	1	20

630   Table III. Regression model for $\langle S \rangle$. R^2 was 0.94 for 20 observations, and the F-ratio was 89 with

631   a P-value <0.0001.

Term	β	Std Error	t Ratio	Prob>|t|
Intercept	0.63	0.01	44.45	<.0001
A	0.06	0.01	11.63	1.3E-10
CP1	-0.07	0.01	-6.1	1.8E-8
A*CP1	0.05	0.01	7.86	4.6E-7

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Structural biology of the hypothesis and the organization of data adduced as

evidence. A. The hypothesis. The Class I Urzyme has an ancestry distinct from that of the internal

CP1 insertion, which together make up the Class I catalytic domain. The activated

aminoacyladenylate is also shown as sticks. Cartoons were prepared for the tryptophanyl-tRNA

synthetase, the smallest of the Class I aaRS. The entire structural array appears intact in each of

the remaining nine Class I aaRS. The anticodon-binding domains are substantially more

idiosyncratic, and are not shown in the scheme. Previous work established that the CP1 insertion

has little impact on the enzymatic properties of the Urzyme (Li, L. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2013).

Colors match those in the schematic (C). The amino terminal crossover connection (blue) is the

protozyme. B. Overlapping of the portions of Class I and II aaRS as envisioned in the ancestral

bidirectional gene by Rodin and Ohno (Rodin, S.N. and Ohno, S. 1995) coincide with the

respective Class I and II Urzymes (Pham, Y., Li, L., et al. 2007, Carter, C.W., Jr., Li, L., et al.

2014). Vertical lines denote ancestral base-pairing. Grey segments were presumably more recent

additions. In particular, insertion of CP1 is incompatible with bidirectional coding. C. Schematic

of the location of CP1 between two roughly equal fragments of the Urzyme, colored to allow

identification of structural fragments in A. Intensely colored segments are highly conserved

secondary structures in all 10 Class I aaRS and compose the Class I scaffold. Subclass I A enzymes

contain one or more additional insertions (red). C. Sampled alignments consisting of different

segments totaling 20 amino acids, selected as described in Methods from the three Urzyme

segments to have the same number of amino acids as the CP1 scaffold alignments.

Figure 2. Mean conservation quality scores, $\langle Q \rangle$ (Thompson, J.D., Higgins, D.G., et al.

1994), for the four segments of the Class I scaffold alignment. Class I signature peptides (Carter,

C.W.J. 1993) are in parentheses. Error bars show the standard error of the mean over all positions

within the segment. The numbers of amino acids in each segment are given for each histogram.

Figure 3. DensiTree representations of the Urzyme and CP1 segments of the Class I

structural scaffold. Each aaRS is monophyletic in the Urzyme alignment, whereas several of the

clades in the CP1 alignment, highlighted in color, have separated ancestries.

Figure 4. Regression model for $\langle S \rangle_i$. The R^2 and P value of the model's F-ratio are shown

under the X-axis. Coefficients and their statistics for the model are given in Table II. Individual

$\langle S \rangle$ values are labeled to enable comparison with Fig. 1C.

Figure 5. Coupling effects entailed in aaRS evolution. Progressive increases in the alphabet

size enabled by introducing new aaRS into the context of the ancestral bidirectional gene (grey

background and dashed connecting lines) simultaneously introduce new enhanced specificity and

fundamental changes in selection pressure. The scale of each aaRS quasispecies is indicated by the

diameter of the tube associated with each alphabet as their evolution proceeds upward. Different

colored backgrounds signify altered selection pressures that apply to all extant aaRS at a given

stage of the coding alphabet. Increasing cardinality of the alphabet induces (i) sequence space

inflation as a greater number of distinguishable sequences can be specified; and (ii) progressive

restriction in the diameters of the quasispecies as they approach fully coded sequences in the final

20-letter alphabet. Bold face entries (CP1 and ID) denote qualitative changes in aaRS architecture

shown experimentally to enrich the possible mechanisms for specificity. Note that this scheme and

that in Figure 7 represent evolutionary events before the LUCA.

Figure 6. Structural relationship between the TrpRS Urzyme, CP1, and the anticodon-

binding domain (ABD). The CP1 motif forms an annulus that constrains the motions of the

specificity determining helix (sand) and the Protozyme (yellow), thereby imposing constraints on

the effective size of the amino acid binding pocket. As described in the text, there is experimental

evidence that these constraints contribute to the ability of full-length TrpRS to reject tyrosine in

the transition state complex for tryptophan activation (Li, L. and Carter, C.W., Jr 2013, Weinreb,

V., Li, L., et al. 2014).

Figure 7. Modified Class I aaRS phylogeny consistent with bidirectional coding ancestry

in a peptide/RNA world. Adapted from Fig. 12-2A of ref (Koonin, E.V. 2011). Green circles

represent key stages in the emergence of genetic coding, beginning with ATP-dependent amino

acid activation by the peptides coded by the bidirectional protozyme gene (Martinez, L., Jimenez-

Rodriguez, M., et al. 2015). Magenta shading indicates the progression illustrated in detail in Fig.

5.

696   Figure 1.

699   Figure 2.

703   Figure 3.

Figure 4.

710   Figure 5.

713   Figure 6.

Mosaic Structure of Class I aminoacyl-tRNA synthetases

715   Figure 7