trp aporepressor production is controlled by autogenous regulation and inefficient translation

(tryptophan repression/repressor concentration/promoter efficiency/lac gene fusion)

RICHARD L. KELLEY AND CHARLES YANOFSKY

Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305

Contributed by Charles Yanofsky, February 10, 1982

ABSTRACT We constructed ^a trpR-lacZ gene fusion that specifies a hybrid protein that has full β -galactosidase activity. The gene fusion was associated with the unaltered trpR transcription and translation control region; thus, hybrid β -galactosidase production was an indicator of expression of the trp aporepressor (trpR) operon. To facilitate in vivo expression studies, ^a DNA segment containing the trpR-lacZ gene fusion and the trpR controlling region was transferred to bacteriophage λ and subsequently inserted into the bacterial chromosome. Analyses of hybrid β -galactosidase production showed that the trpR operon is regulated autogenously but that the rate of synthesis of aporepressor varies only 4- to 5-fold in response to changes in the intracellular concentration of tryptophan. Under comparable conditions, the trp operon is regulated by trp repressor \approx 70-fold. Therefore, the operators of the trp operon and the trpR operon must have very different affinities for trp repressor in vivo. The promoter controlling trpR expression was found to be moderately active. Nevertheless, there are only about 50-300 molecules of trp aporepressor per cell. The low aporepressor level appears to be due to inefficient translation of trpR mRNA.

The trp repressor of Escherichia coli regulates at least three unlinked operons: trp , $aroH$, and $trpR$ (1-4). The trp operon codes for the five polypeptides that catalyze the terminal sequence of reactions in tryptophan formation (5), aroH codes for one of three isozymes that perform the initial reaction of the common pathway of aromatic amino acid biosynthesis (6), and trpR codes for the trp aporepressor itself (7). The trpR operon thus is autogenously regulated, and its polypeptide product controls transcription initiation in two biosynthetic operons. The promoters of the three operons contain homologous operators, as expected (4).

Previous indications that the trpR operon was autogenously regulated were based on in vitro analyses of trp repressor binding to trpR operator DNA (4). In this report, we examine regulation of the trpR operon in vivo. Using a trpR-lacZ gene fusion that specifies a fully active hybrid β -galactosidase, we show that the trpR operon is autoregulated 4- to 5-fold in response to changes in the intracellular tryptophan concentration. We also demonstrate that, although the trpR promoter is moderately active, inefficient translation of trpR mRNA results in low cellular levels of trp aporepressor.

METHODS

Growth Conditions. All cells were grown in minimal medium (8) supplemented with 0.2% glucose, 0.2% lactose, 0.3% glycerol, $0.1-0.5$ mM isopropyl- β -D-thiogalactoside, L-tryptophan at 50 μ g/ml, L-proline at 50 μ g/ml, kanamycin at 30 μ g/ml, or ampicillin at 50 μ g/ml as indicated. All temperature-sensitive lysogens were grown at 30-32°C.

DNA Manipulations. Methods for cloning DNA fragments have been described (9). Restriction enzymes (New England BioLabs and Bethesda Research Laboratories) were used according to the supplier's instructions. Plasmid DNA was isolated from transformants as described (10). DNA sequence analyses were carried out by using the method of Maxam and Gilbert (11).

Construction of trpR-lacZ Fusion. Plasmid pMC931 (12) was digested with BamHI and ethanol precipitated, and the ³' ends were filled in with DNA polymerase ^I Klenow fragment (13). Plasmid pRPG16 was cut with HinclI and both fragments were subjected to electrophoresis through 0.6% agarose. The 6.8 kilobase (kb) pMC931 fragment containing lacZY and the 2.4 kb pRPG16 fragment containing the initial portion of $trpR$ were eluted from the gel and blunt-end ligated together as shown in Fig. 1. Cells of strain M182 were transformed with the ligation mixture and one blue colony was isolated after 2 days growth on minimal medium/glucose/proline/kanamycin plates containing 5-bromo-4-chloro-3-indolyl- β -D-galactopyranoside at $40 \mu g/ml$. The transformant contained a plasmid, pTRL1, that gave the predicted restriction fragments around the trpR-lacZ fusion junction but contained a large (3.4-kb) deletion at the other junction that was apparently an artifact of cloning. The 3.4-kb BamHI/EcoRI fragment of pTRL1 was substituted for the analogous region in pMC931 to yield pTRL2 (Fig. 1). The 7.2-kb BamHI fragment of pTRL2 containing the entire trpRlacZ fusion operon was ligated into the BamHI site of pSIBV to yield pTRL3 (Fig. 1). The DNA sequence of pTRL3 from -375 to $+160$ relative to the trpR transcription start site was determined to confirm that the fusion had occurred as designed and that no point mutations had been selected during the cloning procedure (data not shown).

Recombination of the trpR-lacZ Fusion onto Bacteriophage A. To study expression of the hybrid gene in single-copy form, the fused operon was recombined into the temperature-sensitive λ derivative λ Sm4Cm^r in vivo by using the system shown in Fig. 2 (unpublished). This was done by lytically infecting M182/pTRL3 cells with λ Sm4Cm^r and using the resulting lysate to transduce M182 to Lac⁺ on minimal medium/lactose at 30°C. A double crossover occurred as shown in Fig. 2 because pSIBV, and therefore pTRL3, contains DNA sequences flanking the BamHI site that are also present flanking the chloramphenicol-resistance gene in the phage. During recombination, any sequence inserted into the BamHI site of pSIBV can substitute for the Cm^r gene of the phage. The recovered lysogens were screened for sensitivity to kanamycin, chloramphenicol, and high temperature. One such recombinant phage was

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.

Abbreviation: kb, kilobase(s).

used in all later experiments and is designated ASm4TRL3.

Labeling and Quantifying *lac mRNA*. RNA was isolated from [3H]uridine-labeled cultures as described (14) and hybridized to denatured linear DNA immobilized on Schleicher & Schuell BA85 nitrocellulose filters. After 15-18 hr of hybridization at 66°C, the filters were washed, treated with ribonuclease, dried, and assayed. The DNA sources used for labeled RNA extracted from strains containing ASm4TRL3 were pMC931 (a plasmid containing $lacZY$; 2.5 μ g of DNA per filter) and PACYC177 (the parental plasmid; 2.5μ g of DNA per filter). The DNA sources used for labeled RNA from strains containing pTRL3 were λ plac5 (15) and λ CI857 (10 μ g of DNA per filter).

Ouantifying the Amount of **B**-Galactosidase and Fusion Protein in Whole Cell Extracts. Cultures (10 ml) were grown with shaking at 32°C for 3 generations to a cell density of 5×10^8 / ml. $[$ ¹⁴C]Leucine (20 μ g/ml) was added at the time of inoculation. The trpR-lacZ culture contained kanamycin (30 μ g/ ml). Excess (500 μ g/ml) unlabeled leucine was added to each culture 15 min before harvesting the cells. Samples were taken for β -galactosidase assay and for total incorporation determination and the remaining 8 ml was sedimented and washed three times. The labeled cells were lysed by boiling in Laemmli sample buffer (16) and the proteins were separated by electrophoresis in a 7-12% gradient polyacrylamide/NaDodSO₄ gel. The gel was stained with Coomassie blue and the β -galactosidase bands were cut out and dissolved in 100 μ l of 30% H₂O₂ at 65°C. The molecular weight of the fusion polypeptide is $118,000$ compared with 116,000 for the native β -galactosidase polypeptide. The dissolved acrylamide/protein was mixed with 5 ml of Aquasol (New England Nuclear) and assayed in a Packard Scintillation Spectrometer. Control experiments were carried out to determine the extent of quenching.

Bacterial Strains, Plasmids, and Phage. Strain M182 has the entire lac operon deleted (17). The three strains used to prepare lysogens were W3110 tnaA2 AlacUl69, W3110 tnaA2 trpR AlacUl69, and W3110 tnaA2 trpA46PR9 AlacUl69 (18, 19). The *lacU169* deletion, removing the entire *lac* operon, was introduced by cotransduction with the tightly linked proC:Tn5 marker of MB82 (kindly supplied by M. Benedik). pSIBV is ^a derivative of pITS18 (unpublished) containing a BamHI linker in place of the EcoRI site and lacking the BamHI site of the vector. pRLK10 is ^a pBR322 derivative containing a promoterless/operatorless trpR gene in the BamHI site (see Fig. 3). The aporepressor is apparently constitutively produced by using the tet promoter of pBR322 that is located upstream. This supplies the cell with ≈ 20 times the haploid amount of aporepressor. pBN60 is ^a pBR322 derivative containing the trp promoter/operator on a 490-base pair Sau3A fragment. pRPG16 contains trpR on ^a 1.3-kb chromosomal BamHI fragment in pACYC177. Phage Aplac5 contains lacZ and lacY (15).

Enzyme Assays. Anthranilate synthetase from permeabilized cells was measured as described (20). Cultures (5 ml) were grown to a Klett value of 80 and pelleted, and the pellets were washed in the saline, repelleted, and suspended in 0.6 ml of 0.1 M Tris base, pH 7.8/0.1% Triton X-100. The cells were frozen 15 min on dry ice/acetone and thawed. β -Galactosidase assays (21) and protein assays (22) have been reported.

RESULTS

Autogenous Regulation of trpR. A trpR-lacZ fusion and the adjacent trpR regulatory region was inserted into the promotercloning plasmid pSIBV to form pTRL3 (Fig. 1) and then transferred to the promoter-cloning λ derivative λ Sm4Cm^r to produce λ Sm4TRL3 (Fig. 2). Expression of structural genes cloned into the appropriate sites in pSIBV and λ Sm4Cm^r is totally de-

FIG. 1. Construction of plasmid pTRL3 containing the trpR-lacZ fusion. \blacksquare , trpR structural gene; \Box , chromosomal DNA flanking $trpR$; \equiv , portion of the trp operon of Serratia marcescens; \equiv , segment of the lac operon.

pendent on the associated promoter (unpublished). Phage ASm4TRL3 was used to lysogenize three similar lac deletion strains; one was $trpR^+$, the second was $trpR$, and the third was a trp R^+ tryptophan bradytroph carrying the trpA46PR9 mutation in the structural gene for the tryptophan synthetase α

FIG. 2. Construction of ASm4TRL3. Transformed cells containing pTRL3 were lytically infected with ASm4Cmr. Recombination occurred in the homologous regions to give ASm4TRL3 containing the trpR -lacZ fusion.

Cultures were grown with shaking at 32°C (experiments 1-7) or 37°C (experiments 8-10) to ca. 5×10^8 cells/ml. Samples were removed for β -galactosidase assay and the remainder was pulse labeled with [³H]uridine for 1 min. RNA was isolated and hybridized to plasmid lac DNA (cultures 1-7) or phage lac DNA (cultures 8-10) and appropriate control DNAs and the percent labeled RNA that is lac mRNA was determined. Comparable values were obtained in repeat experiments. iPr- β -S-Gal, $isopropyl-*β*-D-thiogalactoside.$

* Genetic background of the strains in experiments 1-6 and 10 was W3110 tnaA2 Δ lacU169 proC::Tn5 and that of the strains in experiments 7 and 8 was W3110 tnaA2.

chain. These strains were assayed for β -galactosidase activity after growth under different conditions (Table 1). As shown, ^a $trpR^{+}$ culture growing in minimal medium contains ≈ 100 units of hybrid β -galactosidase. If exogenous tryptophan is supplied, the level decreases to ≈ 40 units. In contrast, if the culture is trpR, the fused trpR-lacZ' operon is fully derepressed and 160 units of hybrid β -galactosidase are observed, with or without excess tryptophan. The hybrid β -galactosidase levels of lysogens containing the trpA46PR9 mutation in a trpR' background show that, despite the presence of the $trpR^+$ allele, derepressed levels of hybrid β -galactosidase are obtained when cells are starved of tryptophan.

We also compared expression of the trp operon and the trpRlacZ operon as a function of tryptophan availability (Table 2). As shown, the try operon is appreciably repressed in minimal medium (compare trpR and trpR⁺ values) whereas the trpRlacZ operon is repressed only slightly. Furthermore, addition of tryptophan leads to much greater repression of the try operon than of the $trpR$ -lacZ operon. Thus, over the normal trp aporepressor concentrations that exist in vivo, the trp operon is

Table 2. Expression of the trp and trpR-lacZ operons in strains that have excess aporepressor or excess trp operators

Strain characteristics	trpR operon expression*		trp operon expression ⁺	
	$-Trp$	$+{\rm Trp}$	-Tro	$+Trp$
trpR	150	152	1,020	920
$trpR^+$	90	33	100	13
$trpR^+/pRLK10$	20	0.62	75	7.3
$trpR^+/pBN60$	117	96	171	118

Expression of the trpR-lacZ fusion operon and the trp operon are compared under various conditions. Results are averages of two experiments, each with duplicate cultures. Growth was in minimal medium/0.2% glucose/proline with $(+Trp)$ or without $(-Trp)$ added tryptophan. The strain used is W3110 tnaA2 AlacU169 proC::Tn5 (ASm4TRL3) with the noted differences.

 t trpR expression is measured from the trpR-lacZ fusion operon and is presented as units of β -galactosidase.

 t trp operon expression is measured by anthranilate synthetase (trpE) polypeptide production and is expressed as percent specific activity relative to that of wild-type cells grown in minimal medium (set at 100). Although ASm4TRL3 contains a promoterless S. marcescens trpE downstream from the trpR-lacZ fusion, it does not contribute measurable amounts of anthranilate synthetase. This was shown by also measuring phosphoribosyltransferase (trpD) activity, which was indistinguishable from the trpE activities shown.

clearly more responsive to changes in the availability of tryptophan. When the aporepressor level is increased (by providing a plasmid, pRLK1O, that constitutively overproduces the aporepressor), trpR-lacZ expression is reduced in minimal medium and dramatically so in the presence of tryptophan. Note that the high trp aporepressor level has only a slight effect on trp operon expression. These findings suggest that the aporepressor concentration limits $trpR$ repression and that the trp operon operator has a higher affinity for trp repressor than does the trpR operator. When ^a multicopy plasmid containing the trp operator, pBN60, was introduced into the same strains, and the strains were grown with excess tryptophan, expression of both the trpR and the trp operons was elevated appreciably. Apparently, in cells that have a single copy of $trpR^+$, autoregulation cannot increase trp aporepressor production significantly in response to additional *trp* operon operators. In minimal medium, the extra copies of the trp operator have only a slight effect on expression of the two operons. These findings establish that both tryptophan and aporepressor limit repression of the trpR operon, while the trp operon is near maximal repression when the haploid level of trp repressor is present.

Regulation Is at the Level of Transcription Initiation. The level of lac mRNA produced by the various lysogens was measured to confirm that the modulation of hybrid β -galactosidase production was due to regulation of transcription initiation. The percentage of total labeled RNA that hybridized to lac-specific DNA is shown in Table 1. It can be seen that mRNA levels vary directly with hybrid β -galactosidase activity. If we calculate the ratio of enzyme specific activity to percent lac mRNA, it is evident that, under all growth conditions, approximately the same proportion is obtained regardless of whether haploid lysogens or strains with high copy number plasmids are examined.

The trpR Transcript Is Translated Inefficiently. When wildtype β -galactosidase activity and lac mRNA were measured as controls in the above experiments, a different ratio of enzyme activity to lac mRNA was observed (Table 1). This difference is subject to several interpretations. The transcript of the fusion operon might be degraded more rapidly than lac mRNA and thus be available for translation for a shorter period. This possibility was ruled out by measuring the half-lives of the two messages, which were essentially identical. A second explanation is that both mRNAs are translated equally to yield the same number of protein molecules, but the hybrid protein is only 20% as active enzymatically as wild-type β -galactosidase. This possibility was eliminated by quantifying the amount of β -galac-

The quantity of wild-type β -galactosidase (β -gal) or trpR-lacZ fusion protein is compared with the corresponding enzymatic specific activities. The three strains used were W3110 tnaA2 Δ lacU169 proC::Tn5 (lac deletion), W3110 tnaA2 (wild-type lac⁺), and W3110 tnaA2 Δ lacU169 proC::Tn5 λ Sm4TRL3 (trpR-lacZ fusion). The cultures had the following ¹⁴C specific activities (cpm/ μ g of total cell protein): lac deletion, 5,000; wild-type lac⁺, 6,750; fusion, 7,200.

 $*$ Net cpm in β -gal band (corrected for cpm loaded) = gross cpm in β -gal band $-$ (1,024/540,000) cpm loaded. Samples containing acrylamide and H_2O_2 had 87% as much radioactivity as protein samples alone.

tosidase and hybrid β -galactosidase isotopically in extracts of whole cells and comparing these values with the corresponding enzyme specific activities. As shown in Table 3, equal amounts of protein correspond to equal β -galactosidase specific activities. A third interpretation, which seems most likely, is that ribosomes translate the trpR message inefficiently. This explanation is consistent with expectations based on examination of the nucleotide sequence preceding the start codon for the trpR protein (Fig. 3). This region has essentially no homology to the consensus Shine-Dalgarno sequence believed necessary for efficient translation initiation (23). lacZ mRNA contains such a sequence (24).

Promoter Strength. If the amount of *lac* mRNA produced from the wild-type lac promotor is compared with that from the trpR-lacZ promoter (Table 1), the fully derepressed trpR promoter is \approx 10% as active as the *lac* promoter induced with iso $propyl-B-D-thiogalactoside.$ This level of promoter activity is unexpectedly high for a gene whose product is apparently needed in small amounts. By using a different measuring system, the strength of the $trpR$ promoter has been related to many other promoters and found to be essentially the same as reported here (unpublished).

Calculation of the Number of Repressor Molecules Per Cell. By using the data in Tables ¹ and 3, we can estimate the number of repressor molecules (RM) in each cell. If 2.87% of the total cellular protein corresponds to 7,200 units (U) of hybrid β -galactosidase (β -gal), and there is \approx 150 μ g of protein per 10⁹ cells (21, 25), then

$$
RM = \frac{0.0287}{7,200 \text{ U of }\beta\text{-gal}} \times \frac{150 \text{ }\mu\text{g of protein}}{10^9 \text{ cells}}
$$

$$
\times \frac{1 \text{ }\mu\text{mol of }\beta\text{-gal}}{118 \times 10^3 \text{ }\mu\text{g of protein}} \times \frac{6.02 \times 10^{17} \text{ monomers}}{\mu\text{mol}}
$$

=
$$
\frac{3 \text{ monomers}}{\text{cell-U of }\beta\text{-gal}}
$$

Thus, a wild-type cell growing in minimal medium has ≈ 300 repressor monomers or 150 dimers. This value is twice the estimate made years ago on the basis of in vitro repressor binding studies (26). Although previous reports suggested that the trp repressor was a tetramer (4), recent crosslinking experiments indicate that it is actually a dimer (A. Joachimiak and P. Sigler, personal communication).

Our estimate of three monomers per unit of β -galactosidase activity is one-third that of others (27). We do not know the source of this discrepancy.

DISCUSSION

Purified trp aporepressor, when activated by L-tryptophan, can protect restriction sites in the trpR operator and inhibit tran-

scription initiation at the trpR promoter (4). As shown here, the trp repressor regulates its own synthesis in vivo. Interestingly, we find that E. coli modulates synthesis of the trp aporepressor over only a 5-fold range; the aporepressor level depends on whether the cell is tryptophan starved, synthesizing tryptophan, or provided with an exogenous supply of the amino acid. Apparently the ability to realize this small regulatory change affecting this minor protein component was sufficiently important to the bacterium to have led to the development of an appropriate regulatory mechanism.

The direction of regulatory change is opposite to what might be expected; i.e., less trp aporepressor is synthesized when the intracellular tryptophan concentration is high-when the cell needs the repressor to shut off its two target biosynthetic operons, the trp and aroH operons. However, our results indicate that in the presence of excess tryptophan the aporepressor level is adequate, since providing more aporepressor causes only a modest increase in trp operon repression. We believe that ^a reasonable explanation for the narrow range and direction of trpR expression is that the bacterium is attempting to maintain a level of active trp repressor sufficient to control transcription initiation in its target operons at all tryptophan concentrations. We suggest that, in the presence of excess tryptophan, essentially all trp aporepressor molecules are actively complexed with tryptophan and available for operator binding. Under such conditions, a small number of aporepressor molecules would suffice since every molecule would be active. However, when cells are growing in minimal medium and synthesizing their own tryptophan, they also require active repressor since the trp operon is $\approx 90\%$ repressed; i.e., trp operon enzyme levels in trpR⁺ cultures growing in minimal medium are \approx 1/10th those of trpR mutants in the same medium (see Table 2). To accomplish this regulation, the cell must form an appropriate number of active repressor molecules despite a low intracellular tryptophan concentration. To maintain this level of active repressor molecules during growth in minimal medium, we believe that the bacterium increases the aporepressor concentration 2- to 3-fold. A prediction of our proposal is that the repressed level of trp aporepressor would be inadequate to control trp operon expression in minimal medium.

The requirement for a modest level of active trp repressor molecules could be met by a constitutively expressed operon. Perhaps this is not what occurs in E. coli because there are at least three different operator DNA sequences that must be regulated by the repressor. Each may be regulated differently as the intracellular concentration of repressor is varied. This is clearly so for the trp vs. trpR operons. We have not yet examined aroH expression as a function of repressor concentration.

The trpR operon was found to have a moderately active promoter and to specify a transcript that is poorly translated. Inefficient translation can be explained by the absence of a recognizable Shine-Dalgarno region preceding the AUG initiation

FIG. 3. Fine structure around the trpR-lacZ fusion in pTRL3. Plasmid pRPG16 was the source of the trpR regulatory region and the initial segment of trpR. The sequence preceding the ATG start codon lacks good homology to the 3' end of 16S RNA. The organization of pRLK10 is shown; in this plasmid, the trpR promoter and operator have been replaced by the tetracycline-resistance promoter of pBR322. \blacksquare , Location of a BamHI linker used in construction.

codon for the trpR protein (see Fig. 3). These characteristics raise the question- is there an advantage to this arrangement over one in which the operon has a weaker promoter and specifies ^a mRNA that is efficiently translated? We speculate that the existing arrangement reflects the possibility that under certain conditions promoters must compete for RNA polymerase molecules. If the trpR promoter had ^a poor affinity for RNA polymerase, there might be circumstances, such as a shift to rapid growth conditions, in which the trpR operon could not compete for polymerase effectively and therefore would not be transcribed. If the aporepressor concentration were low at the start of such a shift, the level might fall below some critical minimal threshold value. By having a good trpR promoter, the bacterium may ensure that synthesis of a moderate supply of trpR mRNA will occur under all conditions. The requirement for few aporepressor molecules is then satisfied by inefficient translation. Alternatively, the nature of the repressor-operator interaction responsible for autogenous control of transcription initiation in the trpR operon may demand a moderately active promoter-i.e., one that is frequently complexed with RNA polymerase. Regardless of the explanation for the present arrangement, our findings provide evidence suggesting that translational efficiency plays a major role in establishing the level of expression of an operon.

Our results do not agree with those of Bogosian et aL (28). Using a similar trpR-lacZ fusion, they found much higher expression and no autogenous regulation unless repressor was overproduced from ^a plasmid. We feel that their results are best explained by read-through transcription from the pBR322 tetracycline-resistance promoter in the EcoRI-Sal ^I fragment they used in the construction of their trpR-lacZ fusion.

We thank R. Gunsalus for generously supplying plasmids and suggesting the strategy for fusing trpR to lacZ. I. Stroynowski supplied the plasmid-phage recombination system and K. Cho communicated results prior to publication. M. van Cleemput helped with the DNA sequence analyses. These studies were supported by grants from the U. S. Public Health Service (GM 09738), the National Science Foundation (PCM 77-24333), and the American Heart Association (69C-15). R.K. is a Predoctoral Trainee of the U.S. Public Health Service; C.Y. is a Career Investigator of the American Heart Association.

- 1. Zubay, G., Morse, D. E., Schrenk, W. I. & Miller, J. H. (1972) Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 69, 1100-1103.
- 2. Brown, K. D. (1968) Genetics 60, 31–48.
3. Zurawski G. Gunsalus, B. P. Brown
- Zurawski, G., Gunsalus, R. P., Brown, K. D. & Yanofsky, C. (1981)J. Mol Biol 145, 47-73.
- 4. Gunsalus, R. P. & Yanofsky, C. (1980) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 77, 7117-7121.
- 5. Yanofsky, C. (1971) J. Am. Med. Assoc. 218, 1026-1035.
6. Pittard. J., Camakaris, L. & Wallace, B. J. (1969) J. Baci
- Pittard, J., Camakaris, L. & Wallace, B. J. (1969) J. Bacteriol 97, 1241-1247.
- 7. Morse, D. E. & Yanofsky, C. (1969) J. Mol. Biol. 44, 185–193.
8. Vogel H. J. & Bonner, D. M. (1956) J. Biol. Chem. 218, 97–10
- 8. Vogel, H. J. & Bonner, D. M. (1956) J. Biol. Chem. 218, 97-106.
9. Gunsalus B. P., Zurawski, G. & Yanofsky, C. (1979) J. Bacteriol.
- Gunsalus, R. P., Zurawski, G. & Yanofsky, C. (1979) J. Bacteriol. 140, 106-113.
- 10. Birnboin, H. C. & Doly, J. (1979) Nucleic Acids Res. 7, 1513-1523.
- 11. Maxam, A. M. & Gilbert, W. (1977) Proc. Nati Acad. Sci. USA 74, 560-564.
- 12. Casadaban, M. J., Chou, J. & Cohen, S. N. (1980) J. Bacteriol 143, 971-980.
- 13. Schneider, W. P., Nichols, B. P. & Yanofsky, C. (1981) Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 78, 2169-2173.
- 14. Baker, R. F. & Yanofsky, C. (1968) Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 60, 313-320.
- 15. Shapiro, J., Machattie, L., Eron, L., Ihler, G., Ippen, K. & Beckwith, J. (1969) Nature (London) 224, 768-774.
- 16. Laemmli, U. K. (1970) Nature (London) 227, 680-685.
- 17. Casadaban, M. J. & Cohen, S. N. (1980) J. Mol Biol 138, 179-207.
- 18. Yanofsky, C. & Horn, V. (1981) *J. Bacteriol.* 145, 1334–1341.
19. Henning, U. & Yanofsky, C. (1962) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA
- 19. Henning, U. & Yanofsky, C. (1962) Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 48, 1497-1504.
- 20. Yanofsky, C. & Soll, L. (1977)J. Mol. Biol 113, 663-677.
- 21. Miller, J. (1972) Experiments in Molecular Genetics (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY).
- 22. Lowry, O., Rosebrough, N., Farr, A. & Randall, R. (1951) J. Biol. Chem. 193, 265-275.
-
- 23. Shine, J. & Dalgarno, L. (1975) Nature (London) 254, 34–38.
24. Reznikoff. W. S. & Abelson, J. N. (1978) in The Operon. 24. Reznikoff, W. S. & Abelson, J. N. (1978) in The Operon, eds. Miller, J. H. & Reznikoff, W. S. (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY), pp. 221-243.
- 25. Maaloe, 0. & Kjeldgaard, N. 0. (1966) in Control of Macromolecular Synthesis (Benjamin, Reading, MA), p. 90.
- 26. Rose, J. K. & Yanofsky, C. (1974) Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 71, 3134-3138.
- 27. Guarente, L., Lauer, G., Roberts, T. M. & Ptashne, M. (1980) Cell 20, 543-553.
- 28. Bogosian, G., Bertrand, K. & Somerville, R. (1981) J. Mol. Biol. 149, 821-825.