

A differential response element for the homeotics at the Antennapedia P1 promoter of *Drosophila*

(transcription/gene regulation/homeodomain protein)

EMMA E. SAFFMAN[†] AND MARK A. KRASNOW[‡]

Department of Biochemistry, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Communicated by David S. Hogness, April 13, 1994

ABSTRACT Homeotic genes encode DNA-binding transcription factors that specify the identity of a segment or segments in particular body regions of *Drosophila*. The developmental specificity of these proteins results from their differential regulation of various target genes. This specificity could be achieved by use of different regulatory elements by the homeoproteins or by use of the same elements in different ways. The Ultrabithorax (UBX), abdominal-A (ABD-A), and Antennapedia (ANTP) homeoproteins differentially regulate the Antennapedia P1 promoter in a cell culture cotransfection assay: UBX and ABD-A repress, whereas ANTP activates P1. Either of two regions of P1 can confer this pattern of differential regulation. One of the regions lies downstream and contains homeoprotein-binding sites flanking a 37-bp region called BetBS. ANTP protein activates transcription through the binding sites, whereas UBX and ABD-A both activate transcription through BetBS and use the flanking binding sites to prevent this effect. Thus, homeoproteins can use the same regulatory element but in very different ways. Chimeric UBX-ANTP proteins and UBX deletion derivatives demonstrate that functional specificity in P1 regulation is dictated mainly by sequences outside the homeodomain, with important determinants in the N-terminal region of the proteins.

The homeotic selector genes that include Antennapedia (*Antp*), Ultrabithorax (*Ubx*), and abdominal-A (*abd-A*) are a family of related but distinct developmental regulators that specify the differences in the body segments of *Drosophila melanogaster* (1–3). Each gene and the homeoproteins it encodes (ANTP, UBX, and ABD-A, respectively) is associated with the identity of a particular segment or group of segments in which it is expressed. The homeotics are similar in that they act at similar times and control homologous aspects of morphology in the different segments. In certain cells and tissues different homeotics even have identical functions. For example, *Ubx* and *abd-A* each suppress the formation of sensory structures called Keilin's organs in their respective domains of expression (1). But these regulators are also quite distinct from one another, as seen by the different segment morphologies that result when they are artificially expressed in the same domain during development (4–6).

The ANTP, UBX, and ABD-A homeoproteins are DNA-binding transcription factors that show 90% or more identity in their DNA-binding homeodomains but show very little similarity outside this 60-residue region (7, 8). Studies of homeoproteins *in vitro* demonstrate that their intrinsic DNA-binding specificities are very similar (9–13), and they can act through the same sites and regulate the same target genes in cell culture cotransfection experiments (10, 14–16) and probably in the developing animal as well (11, 13). These findings can explain their common developmental functions.

The distinct developmental functions of the homeoproteins presumably result from differences in target gene regulation: either they regulate different target genes or they regulate the same target genes differently. Such regulatory differences could be due to use of different regulatory elements (*targeting* differences), or from differences in the functional consequences of the proteins at the same regulatory elements (*activity* differences). Although their similar intrinsic DNA-binding properties argue for the importance of activity differences, some differences in binding specificity *in vitro* have been detected (12, 13, 17). Furthermore, targeting *in vivo* might be altered in a variety of ways, such as by interactions with coregulators, as shown for some distantly related homeodomain proteins (18, 19). Most studies of chimeric homeoproteins indicate that developmental specificity is dictated by structural elements in or near the homeodomain (5, 20–24), but since this region may harbor activity determinants as well as DNA-binding and targeting determinants, these results do not unambiguously distinguish between the specificity mechanisms. The mechanisms are best distinguished by precise mapping of homeoprotein response elements at genes that are differentially regulated by the homeoproteins.

Antp is itself differentially regulated by the homeotics. Its two promoters, P1 and P2, are separated by ≈65 kb, and they are under independent control; both are repressed by UBX and ABD-A in many tissues where expression of the homeotics overlaps (25–28). In contrast, ANTP has little effect on its own expression in most tissues (26, 28), and where effects have been observed they are stimulatory (13). The homeoproteins also differentially regulate P1 in a cotransfection assay in *Drosophila* S2 cells: UBX and ABD-A repress P1, whereas ANTP weakly activates P1 (refs. 10 and 14; B. Appel, S. Sakonju, and M.A.K., unpublished data; see below). Two UBX response elements have been identified in this assay (E. Parker and M.A.K., unpublished data). The major element maps to the P1 core promoter region, away from all high-affinity UBX-binding sites. UBX represses through this element by somehow rendering the promoter insensitive to upstream enhancers. A second element lies downstream and includes two UBX-binding regions centered at +320 and +420 bp.

In this paper, we map the ABD-A and ANTP response elements at P1 and localize structural determinants in the homeoproteins that confer specificity in regulation of P1. We find that the three homeoproteins can all act through the same downstream element to differentially regulate P1 expression, demonstrating that regulatory specificity can result from differences in activity rather than targeting. At least part of this specificity stems from differences in their interactions

Abbreviations: CAT, chloramphenicol acetyltransferase; UBX, Ultrabithorax; ABD-A, abdominal-A; ANTP, Antennapedia.

[†]Present address: Department of Biology, McGill University, Montreal, PQ Canada H3A-1B1.

[‡]To whom reprint requests should be addressed.

The publication costs of this article were defrayed in part by page charge payment. This article must therefore be hereby marked "advertisement" in accordance with 18 U.S.C. §1734 solely to indicate this fact.

with an unusual regulatory element in the 37-bp region that separates the two UB_X-binding regions.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Transcriptional Reporter Plasmids. The pP_{Antp}P1CAT reporter plasmid contains a genomic fragment of P_{Antp}P1 (−6 to +0.79 kb) in pC4CAT (14). The other plasmids in Fig. 1 (pEP1015, pEP1006, and pEP1009) are deletion derivatives of pP_{Antp}P1CAT made by E. Parker (E. Parker and M.A.K., unpublished work). ΔAB (pES2000) has the A and B binding regions in the −0.42- to +0.79-kb *Antp* P1 construct replaced with *Nhe* I and *Spe* I restriction sites, respectively. ΔAB/BetBS (pES2005) was made by cutting ΔAB with *Nhe* I and *Spe* I and religating to remove the intervening BetBS region. Constructs with the A (5′-GCCCCGCTAAGATCATAAAG-GCCGTAAAAATAATCATAACAATAATCGTAAATAATTAGAACCG) and B (5′-AGATCGTCAT-AAACCCATTATTATAATAAACCCTAATCGTAACCGTAATCGTAATTGTAATCGCAG) UB_X-binding regions (+290 to +352 and +385 to +452 of P1, respectively) inserted at −47 bp at the *Adh* (alcohol dehydrogenase) distal promoter were made by cloning these sequences with added *Xba* I linkers into the *Xba* I site of pD-33CAT.

Homeoprotein Expressor Plasmids and Transfections. Expressor plasmids have cDNAs that encode the homeoproteins inserted downstream of the actin 5C promoter in the vector pPac (14). pPacUB_X I^{wt}, pPacUB_X I^{S/B} (which has a frameshift mutation in *Ubx* codon 8), and pPacANTP I_b are described elsewhere (10, 14, 16). pPacABD-A (provided by B. Appel and S. Sakonju, University of Utah) has a 1.9-kb *abd-A* cDNA inserted in the *Bam*HI site of pPac. pPacABD-A^{ts} has a frameshift mutation in *abd-A* codon 16 that was

introduced by cutting pPacABD-A with *Bsp*EI and filling-in the ends. Plasmids that express UB_X deletion derivatives and chimeric UB_X–ANTP proteins were constructed in pPac from related constructs in the CaSpeR vector (23). For pPacUUA and pPacUAA, a 2.2- or 2.0-kb *Bam*HI–*Eco*RI fragment, respectively, from the related CaSpeR construct, was end-filled and inserted into the filled *Bam*HI site of pPac. For pPacUUA, a 2-kb *Bam*HI fragment was inserted into the *Bam*HI site of pPac. For pPacUAA, a 1.8-kb *Stu* I–*Eco*RI fragment was end-filled and used to replace the *Stu* I/*Xba* I fragment containing almost the entire *Ubx* coding and 3′ untranslated regions of a plasmid (pPacUB_X^{Q50A/N51A/R53A}) that contains an introduced *Xba* I site in the 3′ untranslated region to facilitate cloning. These plasmids produced similar levels of proteins (within 2-fold of wild-type UB_X), as determined by immunoblotting of S2 cell extracts with a UB_X antibody. The apparent molecular mass of the proteins were as follows: UB_X I_a, 37 kDa (calculated mass 39.1 kDa); UAA, 32 kDa (37.8 kDa); UUA, 37 kDa (39.1 kDa). UUA and UAA each produced two approximately equimolar species with a molecular mass of 29 and 32 kDa (calculated mass 35.5 and 35.6 kDa for UUA and UAA, respectively). pPacUB_X I_b^{AN} (14) expresses the *UUA derivative that lacks UB_X residues 37–225.

Cotransfection of Schneider line 2 (S2) cells and CAT assays were performed under our standard conditions (14). Each transfection was done in duplicate, and the results were averaged. Values reported are the average and SE of two or more separate experiments.

RESULTS

An *Antp* P1-CAT reporter construct that contains P1 sequences from −6 to +0.79 kb was repressed ≈20-fold by both UB_X and ABD-A in a cotransfection assay in *Drosophila* S2 cells; ANTP activated the same promoter severalfold (Fig. 1A). To localize the cis-regulatory elements required for the differential response to the homeoproteins, deletion derivatives of the P1 construct were tested. A P1 construct was tested that extends from −0.42 to +0.05 kb; it lacks basal enhancer elements that lie upstream of −0.42 but includes a UB_X repression element in the core promoter region. This construct was similarly regulated by all three homeoproteins, each repressing expression severalfold (Fig. 1B). When either the region upstream of −0.42 (Fig. 1C) or the region downstream of +0.05 (Fig. 1D) was also present, however, the differential response was restored, with ANTP activating and UB_X and ABD-A repressing expression. Thus, either of two regions, one between −6 and −0.42 kb and the other between +0.05 and +0.79 kb, can confer a differential response to the homeotics.

We focus here on the downstream region because it is much smaller and it includes two well-characterized UB_X-binding regions that seemed likely to be involved in regulation by the three homeoproteins because they have similar DNA-binding specificities. Furthermore, no P1 sequences upstream of −33 bp are required for the effect of the downstream region (data not shown), and preliminary experiments indicate that the downstream region can confer differential regulation by UB_X and ANTP on the *Drosophila* *Adh* distal promoter (E. Parker and M.A.K., unpublished data). Thus, differential regulation by the homeoproteins does not appear to require any specific elements outside the downstream region.

The two downstream UB_X-binding regions, termed A and B here, are located between +290 and +452 bp; each is ≈63 bp long (9). The binding regions are separated by a 37-bp region we call BetBS, for *between* the *binding* sites (see below). When the binding sites were either deleted (ΔAB, Fig. 2) or replaced with a random sequence (data not shown),




FIG. 1. Effects of UB_X, ABD-A, and ANTP homeoproteins on deletion derivatives of the *Antp* P1 promoter. *Drosophila* S2 cells were cotransfected with various P1 promoter constructs driving expression of chloramphenicol acetyltransferase (CAT) and either a UB_X (U, pPacUB_X I^{wt}), an ABD-A (AA, pPacABD-A), an ANTP (AN, pPacANTP I_b) expressor plasmid, or a nonexpressing control plasmid (−, pPacUB_XI^{S/B}) as indicated. The P1 constructs tested were as follows: (A) pP_{Antp}P1CAT, (B) pEP1015, (C) pEP1009, and (D) pEP1006. Their structures are schematized; the filled and open boxes represent the two regions of P1 that can confer a differential response to the homeotics. CAT activity in extracts of the cotransfected cells is shown, normalized to the basal activity of the standard P1 construct in A. Values are the average and standard error of at least two experiments, each done in duplicate. Numbers below each graph show the relative effects of the homeoproteins.




FIG. 2. Homeoprotein regulation of *Antp* P1 constructs lacking the downstream binding sites. Standard cotransfection experiments were done with the UBX, ABD-A, or ANTP expressor plasmids and a promoter construct containing P1 sequences from -0.42 to $+0.79$ kb, a derivative called ΔAB that lacks UBX-binding regions A and B (filled boxes; each ≈ 63 bp long; their sequences are given in *Materials and Methods*), or a derivative called $\Delta AB/BetBS$ that lacks A and B and the 37-bp region (open box; 5'-CAATCAGTCG-CACACTGTCCATCGCATGGCGCAGATC; called BetBS) that normally separates A and B. The effect of each protein is expressed as fold activation (ratio of promoter activity in the presence of effector protein to that in the presence of a nonexpressing control plasmid) or fold repression (the inverse ratio).

we found that regulation by all three proteins was reversed. ANTP no longer activated P1. Instead, it repressed expression, much as it repressed the P1 construct that contained the central promoter region alone (see Fig. 1B). This result indicates that the downstream UBX-binding sites function as an activation element for ANTP. Consistent with this, the A and B binding regions each conferred dramatic activation by ANTP (≈ 120 -fold and ≈ 40 -fold, respectively) on the *Adh* distal promoter when placed at -47 bp, just upstream of the *Adh* TATA element (data not shown).

In contrast to the results with ANTP, we found that UBX and ABD-A both activated the P1 promoter when the binding sites were removed (ΔAB , Fig. 2). This activation occurs through the BetBS element located between the binding sites: when this 37-bp element was removed along with the A and B binding sites, all three proteins repressed the P1 promoter

($\Delta AB/BetBS$, Fig. 2). The BetBS element is an unusual UBX and ABD-A activation element, as it is not bound by purified UBX protein; it is described in detail elsewhere (16).

These results establish several important points with respect to homeotic regulatory specificity. (i) All three homeoproteins can act through the downstream binding sites. (ii) The homeoproteins use the binding sites in very different ways. At their normal position at P1, only ANTP appears to use the binding sites in a simple way, as a conventional activation element. (iii) The 37-bp region between the binding sites is itself an unusual regulatory element that discriminates among the homeoproteins: UBX and ABD-A activate through this element, whereas ANTP does not. (iv) An interesting interaction exists between the binding sites and the BetBS element, at least for UBX and ABD-A: both proteins appear to act through the binding sites to somehow prevent activation via the neighboring BetBS element. There may also be an analogous effect of neighboring sequences on the function of the homeoprotein bound to the binding sites. We found that UBX activated transcription through the A binding region when it was fused upstream of the *Adh* distal promoter (≈ 5 -fold activation with a single copy and ≈ 25 -fold with two copies in tandem), but this activation function of UBX through the A binding region is apparently suppressed in the context of the *Antp* P1 promoter.

To identify the domains of the homeoproteins responsible for their different regulatory effects, it is reasonable to consider regions that are shared by UBX and ABD-A but different in ANTP. Their primary structures are schematized in Fig. 3. The 60-residue homeodomain region is the only large region of homology, and it is highly similar in all three proteins. Homeodomain residues 2, 24, and 56 are shared by UBX and ABD-A (Arg-2, His-24, and Leu-56) but differ in ANTP (Lys-2, Arg-24, and Trp-56). A short region C-terminal to the homeodomain (filled box in Fig. 3) is also similar among UBX (amino acids AIKELNEQ) and ABD-A (amino acids AVKEINEQ) but different in ANTP (amino acids TKGEPGSG).

To investigate the roles of these regions in regulation, we assayed deletion derivatives of UBX and also chimeric homeoproteins with parts of UBX replaced by ANTP (diagrammed in Fig. 3) for their ability to regulate P1. Fig. 4A shows the effects of the UBX derivatives on the standard P1




FIG. 3. Comparison of UBX, ABD-A, and ANTP homeoproteins. Diagrams of the primary structures of UBX (stippled box), ABD-A (hatched box), and ANTP (open box) and various UBX-ANTP chimeras and UBX deletion derivatives are shown with a comparison of their effects in four functional assays. Effects in the assays are designated U (UBX-like), A (ANTP-like), u (weak UBX), a (weak ANTP), or a/u (mixed). + and - represent activating or repressing effects, respectively; PS6 refers to the transformation of larval denticle belts to a parasegment 6 identity caused by ectopic expression of UBX, and PS4 refers to the transformation to parasegment 4 identity caused by ectopic expression of ANTP. Protein structures are shown aligned by their homeodomain homology. An 8-residue region of homology between UBX and ABD-A in the C-tail (see text) is shown as a filled box, and other short regions of homology (amino acids MXSYF, YPWM) are also indicated. Cell culture results are from Fig. 4 and embryo results are from ref. 23. Results for AUU are from ref. 10. ND, not determined.




FIG. 4. Regulation of *Antp* P1 constructs by UBX-ANTP chimeras and UBX deletion derivatives. Effects of the various proteins indicated on the expression of the standard P1 construct (see Fig. 1A) (A) or the Δ AB construct (see Fig. 2) (B) in the cotransfection assay. Relative effects of the proteins are given below each graph. See Fig. 3 for their structures. UUU, UBX Ia protein; AAA, ANTP Ib protein; UAA, UBX N terminus with ANTP homeodomain and C-tail; UAU, UBX with ANTP homeodomain; UUA, UBX without C-tail; UAA, UBX N terminus with ANTP homeodomain and no C-tail; *UU, large deletion (residues 37–225) of UBX in the N-terminal region. The derivative proteins were expressed at levels similar to that of wild-type UBX Ia (see Materials and Methods).

construct, which is repressed by UBX and activated by ANTP (see Fig. 1A), and Fig. 4B shows the effects on a P1 deletion derivative (Δ AB) that lacks the A and B binding regions and is activated by UBX and repressed by ANTP (see Fig. 2). The UBX derivative UAU, which has the UBX homeodomain replaced with that of ANTP, behaved very much like wild-type UBX protein (UUU) in both assays. Elsewhere we have shown that substitutions in the DNA-recognition helix of the UBX homeodomain reduce repression of P1 and eliminate activation through BetBS (16). Taken together, these results indicate that the UBX homeodomain is involved in regulation of P1, but it does not play a critical role in specificity of the response. The UBX derivative that lacks the region C-terminal to the homeodomain (UUA) also behaved very much like full-length UBX (Fig. 4), demonstrating that the UBX C-terminal region does not play a crucial role in specificity either. Thus, the two regions common to UBX and ABD-A and absent in ANTP are not the key specificity determinants, although a lesser role for these regions is still possible (see below). The data instead point to an important role for the N-terminal regions. Replacement of the UBX N-terminal region with that of ANTP results in a chimeric protein (AUU) that activated P1 like the original ANTP protein (10), and removal of a large portion of the N-terminal region (*UU) reduced both repression of P1 and activation of the Δ AB construct (Fig. 4).

Although the above results indicate the importance of the N-terminal regions of the ANTP and UBX proteins in dictating regulatory specificity at P1, the other parts of the proteins also appear to contribute. For example, the UAA derivative, which contains the intact UBX N-terminal region but has the ANTP homeodomain and no C-terminal region, repressed P1 much less efficiently than UUA or wild-type UBX, although it still activated the Δ AB construct like wild-type UBX. Also, the UAA construct had effects that were clearly mixed in the assays, with the ANTP C-terminal region having a particularly significant effect on regulation of the Δ AB construct. This result shows that the ANTP homeodomain and C-terminal region together can partially overcome the effects of the UBX N-terminal region. The converse, however, does not appear to be true, as the AUU construct behaves like ANTP, at least in its regulation of P1 (10).

DISCUSSION

We have shown that two different regions, located upstream and downstream of the *Antp* P1 promoter, confer differential regulation by the homeoproteins UBX, ABD-A, and ANTP. The downstream region contains two clusters of homeoprotein-binding sites flanking the 37-bp BetBS sequence; it is a composite regulatory element that distinguishes between the homeotics in several ways. The binding sites serve as a conventional activation element for ANTP, whereas the BetBS sequence is an unusual element that is not bound by purified UBX protein but nevertheless can serve as an activation element for UBX and also for ABD-A. UBX and ABD-A both act through the flanking binding sites to prevent activation through the BetBS sequence. These results are summarized in the model in Fig. 5.

Elsewhere we have proposed that action of UBX through BetBS involves an endogenous factor that binds to this region and interacts with UBX (16). We further proposed that UBX bound at the flanking binding sites interacts with the BetBS factors and forms a complex with them that is functionally distinct from the complex formed in the absence of the binding sites. If these ideas are correct, then the results presented here suggest that the interactions with the BetBS factors are specific for UBX and ABD-A. ANTP does not appear to interact with the BetBS factors but instead binds to the flanking sites and presumably interacts with the general




FIG. 5. Model of the differential effects of homeoproteins through the downstream region of *Antp* P1. ANTP activates P1 through the downstream binding sites (■), whereas UBX activates through BetBS (□), perhaps in conjunction with an endogenous factor (Δ) that binds BetBS. UBX bound at the flanking sites prevents this activation through BetBS. ABD-A behaves as shown for UBX. In addition, all three proteins can repress P1 through the core promoter region, and ANTP can also activate through a separate element (not shown in the diagram) located upstream of -0.42 kb (see Fig. 1).

transcriptional machinery or other factors to activate transcription. Although the specific models are quite speculative, the important conclusion is that UBX, ABD-A, and ANTP each use the downstream binding regions at P1, but UBX and ABD-A use them in a very different manner than ANTP.

Our results demonstrate that differences in activity of the homeotics at a common response element can be critical. However, it seems likely that the overall developmental specificity of the homeotics is achieved through a combination of activity and targeting differences. Although there are few *in vivo* data that bear directly on this issue, recent data suggest that homeotic regulation of the *Antp* P2 promoter in certain neuronal cell types may be governed by activity differences, with ANTP activating through the homeoprotein-binding sites and UBX and ABD-A repressing (13). A number of target genes are known to be regulated by only some homeotics (29), but it is not yet clear that this regulatory specificity is due to targeting differences because the "inactive" homeotics could conceivably target the same regulatory elements but remain functionally silent. One way to assess the relative importance of the two specificity mechanisms *in vivo* is to compare homeoprotein-binding sites on polytene chromosomes (29). If different chromosomal regions are bound by the various homeoproteins, then an important role for targeting is indicated, but if all the same regions are bound, then activity differences are probably key.

The results presented here and elsewhere (10, 14) demonstrate the importance of the N-terminal domain, and lesser roles for the homeodomain and the C-terminal region, in dictating homeodomain regulatory specificity at the *Antp* P1 promoter in S2 cells. This is surprising for two reasons. (i) While UBX and ABD-A appear to exert similar effects through the same regulatory elements at P1, there are no sequence homologies in their N-terminal domains that are not also shared by ANTP. This observation implies that the common functional specificity of UBX and ABD-A derives from unrelated structures in the two proteins or from similarities that will only be apparent in their folded structures. (ii) Most studies of homeoprotein specificity have found that the critical specificity determinants lie in the homeodomain and possibly the surrounding sequences (20–22, 24), whereas our results point to a more important role for regions outside the homeodomain, particularly the N-terminal region. Our results are generally in accord with those of Chan and Mann (23), who analyzed the effect of many of the same chimeras on denticle patterning and repression of the *Distal-less* gene during embryonic development (summarized in Fig. 3). However, there are differences. The most notable is that the UAA chimera behaved like UBX with respect to *Antp* P1 repression in our assays and also with respect to *Distal-less* repression in the embryos, whereas its effect on denticle patterning in the embryo was more like that of ANTP. Also, the UAA construct acted like ANTP with respect to *Distal-less* regulation but had mixed effects on *Antp* P1 expression. The most reasonable explanation of these differences is that there are multiple structural determinants of homeoprotein functional specificity, with different structural domains important for protein and DNA interactions at different regulatory elements. Whereas the *in vivo* phenotypic assays provide an aggregate measure of the effects on many target genes in many tissues, our work has shown that multiple

regulatory mechanisms are used at even a single target in a single cell type. Thus, a full appreciation of the specificity determinants and an understanding of how they contribute to specificity may require a gene by gene and even regulatory element by regulatory element analysis. Such an analysis may become feasible as more targets of homeotics are identified, their regulatory elements are defined, and some of the proteins that interact with the homeotics are known.

We thank Yang Li for preliminary experiments done during a research rotation in the laboratory; Evelyn Parker, Bruce Appel, Shige Sakonju, Siu-Kwong Chan, and Richard Mann for plasmids; and Paul Mitsis and members of our laboratory for comments on the manuscript. This work was supported by a National Institutes of Health training grant (E.E.S.), a Markey Scholar Award in Biomedical Science, a National Science Foundation Presidential Young Investigator Award, and a grant from the National Institutes of Health to M.A.K.

- Lewis, E. B. (1978) *Nature (London)* **276**, 565–570.
- Kaufman, T. C., Seeger, M. A. & Olsen, G. (1990) *Adv. Genet.* **27**, 309–362.
- McGinnis, W. & Krumlauf, R. (1992) *Cell* **68**, 283–302.
- Gibson, G. & Gehring, W. J. (1988) *Development* **102**, 657–675.
- Mann, R. S. & Hogness, D. S. (1990) *Cell* **60**, 597–610.
- Gonzalez-Reyes, A. & Morata, G. (1990) *Cell* **61**, 515–522.
- Scott, M. P., Tamkun, J. W. & Hartzell, G. (1989) *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* **989**, 25–48.
- Affolter, M., Schier, A. & Gehring, W. J. (1990) *Curr. Opin. Cell Biol.* **2**, 485–495.
- Beachy, P. A., Krasnow, M. A., Gavis, E. R. & Hogness, D. S. (1988) *Cell* **55**, 1069–1081.
- Winslow, G. M., Hayashi, S., Krasnow, M., Hogness, D. S. & Scott, M. P. (1989) *Cell* **57**, 1017–1030.
- Vachon, G., Cohen, B., Pfeifle, C., McGuffin, M. E., Botas, J. & Cohen, S. M. (1992) *Cell* **71**, 437–450.
- Ekker, S. C., von Kessler, D. P. & Beachy, P. A. (1992) *EMBO J.* **11**, 4059–4072.
- Appel, B. & Sakonju, S. (1993) *EMBO J.* **12**, 1099–1109.
- Krasnow, M. A., Saffman, E. E., Kornfeld, K. & Hogness, D. S. (1989) *Cell* **57**, 1031–1043.
- Samson, M. L., Jackson, G. L. & Brent, R. (1989) *Cell* **57**, 1045–1052.
- Saffman, E. E. (1993) *Multiple Mechanisms of Transcriptional Regulation by Ultrabithorax Proteins in Drosophila* (Ph.D. thesis, Stanford Univ., Stanford, CA).
- Dessain, S., Gross, C. T., Kuziora, M. A. & McGinnis, W. (1992) *EMBO J.* **11**, 991–1002.
- Stern, S., Tanaka, M. & Herr, W. (1989) *Nature (London)* **341**, 624–630.
- Smith, D. L. & Johnson, A. D. (1992) *Cell* **68**, 133–142.
- Kuziora, M. A. & McGinnis, W. (1989) *Cell* **59**, 563–571.
- Gibson, G., Schier, A., LeMotte, P. & Gehring, W. J. (1990) *Cell* **62**, 1087–1103.
- Lin, L. & McGinnis, W. (1992) *Genes Dev.* **6**, 1071–1081.
- Chan, S. K. & Mann, R. S. (1993) *Genes Dev.* **7**, 796–811.
- Zeng, W., Andrew, D. J., Mathies, L. D., Horner, M. A. & Scott, M. P. (1993) *Development* **118**, 339–352.
- Hafen, E., Levine, M. & Gehring, W. J. (1984) *Nature (London)* **307**, 287–289.
- Boulet, A. M. & Scott, M. P. (1988) *Genes Dev.* **2**, 1600–1614.
- Birmingham, J., Martinez-Arias, A., Petitt, M. G. & Scott, M. P. (1990) *Development* **109**, 553–566.
- Engstrom, Y., Schneuwly, S. & Gehring, W. J. (1992) *Roux Arch. Dev. Biol.* **201**, 65–80.
- Andrew, D. J. & Scott, M. P. (1992) *New Biol.* **4**, 5–15.