Gene for the RNA polymerase σ subunit mapped in *Salmonella* typhimurium and *Escherichia coli* by cloning and deletion

(dnaG/rpoD/transcription)

JOHN G. SCAIFE^{*†}, JOSEPH S. HEILIG^{*}, LEE ROWEN[‡], AND RICHARD CALENDAR^{*§}

*Department of Molecular Biology, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720; and ‡Department of Biochemistry, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California 94305

Communicated by Donald A. Glaser, September 10, 1979

ABSTRACT The genes for the RNA polymerase σ subunit (*rpoD*) and DNA primase (*dnaG*) of Salmonella typhimurium have been cloned into λ vectors. Combined restriction, deletion, and functional analysis of the cloned fragment allows us to map the genes precisely on the fragment, establishes the direction in which *rpoD* is transcribed, and reveals the existence of at least one new gene in the vicinity. A closely homologous, smaller fragment of *Escherichia coli* DNA, also cloned into λ , contains *rpoD* and at least part of *dnaG*.

The genes coding for the σ subunit of RNA polymerase (rpoD)(1-6) and for primase (dnaG) (7, 8) play an important role in the regulation of bacterial growth. Much evidence suggests that rpoD is close to dnaG (2, 3). In this report we show that rpoDand dnaG are contained in a single 5-kilobase (kb) DNA sequence, implying that they are adjacent. To gain insight into their organization, we have cloned these genes in λ phage vectors and mapped them precisely by deletion and restriction endonuclease analysis. Studies on expression of the cloned genes in the presence and absence of λ repression allow us to establish the orientation of rpoD and the location of its promoter.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Bacterial and Phage Strains. Bacterial strains and λ phage vectors are listed in Table 1. λ gt7-(dnaG)St was isolated from a pool of hybrid phages made by M. Thomas by selecting phage carrying the dnaG gene. Phage (10⁸ particles) were mixed with 10^9 BT308 λ^+ cells and, after 15-min adsorption at room temperature, the mixture was spread on an agar plate and incubated at 42°C for 18 hr. Twenty-nine colonies were picked and restreaked. Cultures were grown and treated with CHCl₃. Plaques made by the released phage were picked and grown, and their DNA was analyzed by digestion with restriction enzymes. λ NM540-(*rpoD dnaG*)St was constructed by ligating DNA obtained from *Hin*dIII digests of 500 ng each of λ NM540 and $\lambda gt7-(rpoD dnaG)$ St in 10 μ l containing 0.7 μ g of T4 DNA ligase, 0.5 mM ATP, and 10 mM dithiothreitol. The mixture was incubated for 12 hr at 4°C. The DNA was packaged in vitro (22), and turbid plaques were picked and screened by plaque filter hybridization (23) to the Salmonella typhimurium rpoD dnaG EcoRI 10.8-kb insert fragment. Positive plaques were tested for transduction of BT308 λ^+ , selecting for growth at 42°C. The procedures and materials for growth of phage and bacteria have been described (20, 24).

Restriction Enzyme Analysis. Restriction nucleases were purchased from New England BioLabs or from Bethesda Research Laboratories and were used in accordance with the instructions of the supplier. Enzymes used were *BamHI*, *EcoRI*, *HindIII*, *Kpn I*, *Sal I*, *Sst I*, and *Xho I*. After they were digested, the DNA samples were analyzed by electrophoresis in 10-cm agarose gels containing 90 mM Tris-HCl at pH 8.3, 90 mM boric acid, 2.5 mM EDTA, and either 0.5% or 0.7% agarose. Electrophoresis was for 18 hr at 25 V or for 5 hr at 70 V. Restriction sites were mapped by comparing the DNA fragments from single-enzyme digests with fragments from double-enzyme digests.

RESULTS

Isolation of **A Phages Carrying** rpoD and dnaG. In order to isolate a phage carrying the S. typhimurium genes for DNA primase and for the σ subunit of RNA polymerase, we screened a pool of λ phages containing EcoRI fragments of bacterial DNA for the ability to transduce dnaG. The phages, provided by M. Thomas and R. W. Davis, were made by ligating and packaging EcoRI-cleaved vector $\lambda gt7$ (Table 1) and S. tuphimurium DNA. They were used to infect BT308 λ^+ [Escherichia *coli dna*C308 (λ)], and colonies able to grow at 42°C were used as a source of the desired phage. Some of these, such as λ gt7-(*rpoD dnaG*)St can transduce *rpoD*⁺ as well as *dnaG*⁺ (see below). They carry a 10.8-kb fragment of S. typhimurium DNA. Others cannot transduce to $rpoD^+$ and only contain a part of the 10.8-kb fragment. The whole fragment was purified, labeled with ³²P by nick translation, and used as a probe to identify a homologous DNA fragment from E. coli (Fig. 1). Fragments of E. coli DNA were separated electrophoretically, transferred onto a nitrocellulose sheet, and hybridized with the S. typhimurium probe. Autoradiography revealed that the Salmonella probe hybridized to a 9-kb HindIII fragment of E. coli DNA. For this reason, the 9-kb HindIII fragment was cloned into $\lambda NM762$ (see Table 1). Selection for $dnaG^+$ transducing phages yielded a phage capable of transducing $rpoD^+$ as well as $dnaG^+$. DNA from this phage hybridized strongly with DNA from the Salmonella probe (Fig. 1).

The Cloned *rpoD* and *dnaG* Genes Function *In Vivo*. The mutation *rpoD*285 results in thermolability of the σ subunit of the *E. coli* RNA polymerase. The evidence strongly suggests that *rpoD*285 is in the structural gene for σ (*rpoD*) (5). The *Eco*RI fragment of *S. typhimurium* cloned into phage λ efficiently transduced this mutant (PM101, Table 1) to temperature resistance. Moreover, transductants cured of the λ prophage with a heteroimmune λ phage, *imm* 434, regained temperature-sensitivity in 15 of 18 cases (data not shown). Thus, genetic evidence shows that the *Eco*RI fragment has an active gene able to compensate for *rpoD*285. The following evidence shows that this gene is *rpoD* from *S. typhimurium*.

Bacteria heavily irradiated with UV light virtually cease to make their own proteins but will transcribe and translate genes on an infecting transducing phage. A λ phage containing the *Eco*RI fragment directed UV-irradiated *E. coli* (159 λ^+ , in

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.

Abbreviations: kb, kilobases; ts, temperature-sensitive; Ec, fragment from *Escherichia coli* DNA; St, a fragment from *Salmonella typhimurium*; NaDodSO₄, sodium dodecyl sulfate.

[†] On leave from Department of Molecular Biology, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3JR, Scotland.

[§] To whom reprint requests should be addressed.

DesignationAdditional genotypeOrigin or reference159warA gal str9159\warA gal str (\\\ind^-)9159\warA gal str (\\\ind^-)9285c $F^- argG (ac thi rpoD285)5594str10BT308\^+thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (\\)7PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101F^- argG (ac thi rpoD285(\\)+)From 285c by lysogenizationPM102F^- argG (ac thi rpoD285(\\)+)From 285c by lysogenizationPM104HfrC dnaG312PM105F^- argG (ac thi rpoD285(\\)+)From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°CPM106HfrC dnaG3 (\\)+From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with \ cryptic in galT;13supF (from RW842)15W3102\shift hap D285(\\)15YmelsupF \shift for Sam100the galt with set of the $	Table 1. Bacterial and phage strains			
Bacteria159 $uvrA gal str$ 9159Å $uvrA gal str$ (λind^-)9159Åimm ²¹ $uvrA gal str$ ($\lambda inm21$)From 159 by lysogenization285c $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285$ 5594str10BT308Å+thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)7K1200endA rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C $[\lambda gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St]$ HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationPM106HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in galT;13 $supF$ (from RW842)15Ymel $supF \lambda^*$ 15Ymel $supF \lambda^*$ 15Agt7b522 c1(shnAt-5) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from λ gt4 (16) and the right λ gt4SAgt4Sc1857 nin5 Sam100†Agt4Sc1857 (srlA1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100†Agt4S(srlA1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100†Agt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St1c1857 (srlA1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100†Ayt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St1c1857 (srlA1-2)	Designation	Additional genotype	Origin or reference	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Bacteria			
159 λ^+ $uvrA gal str (\lambda ind^-)$ 9159 λimm^{21} $uvrA gal str (\lambda imm^{21})$ From 159 by lysogenization285c $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285$ 5594 str 10BT308 λ^+ thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)7K1200endA rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C $[\lambda gtT-(dnaG rpoD)St]$ From PC314 by lysogenizationPM106HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in gal T_i 13 $supF$ (from RW842)14W3102 λ^* 14W3110thy15Ymel $supF \lambda^*$ 15Ymel $supF \lambda^*$ 15Agt7b522 cl(shn $\lambda 4.5$) $\Delta nin5$ (ara) coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from λ gt4*Agt4Scl857 nin5 Sam100 \dagger Agt4Scl857 (sr1\lambda1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100 \dagger Agt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 1cl857 (sr1\lambda1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100 \dagger λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 2cl857 (sr1\lambda1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100 \dagger λ mM540(sr1\lambda1-2) Δ shn λ 3* imm21 nin5 shn λ 6°Vector for HindIII fragments (18) λ NM540-(rpoD dnaG)St(att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5 ($supF$)Vector for HindIII fragments (19) λ NM762(att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin57 λ 76-(rp1 rpoBC)Ee(att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin520 </td <td>159</td> <td>uvrA gal str</td> <td>9</td>	159	uvrA gal str	9	
159 λ imm ²¹ uv A gal str (λ imm ²¹)From 159 by lysogenization285cF $^-$ arg G lac thi rpoD2855594str10BT308 λ^+ thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)7K1200end A rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101F $^-$ arg G lac thi rpoD285(λ^+)From 285c by lysogenizationPM102F $^-$ arg G lac thi rpoD285(λ^+)From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C[λ gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St]From PC314 by lysogenizationPM106HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in gal T; supF (from RW842)13W3102 λ^* 14W3104thy15YmelsupF λ^* 15PhagesStart for for for for for for for for λ gt4 (16) and the right arm of λ gt4 (17) this Sam100t λ gt4S (rpoD dnaG)St (srl λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100tVector for HindIII fragments (18) λ NM540 (srl λ -2) Δ ain5 Sam100tNom (62) (rpoD dnaG)St λ mM520 (rpoD dnaG)St(srl λ -2) Δ ain5 Sam100t λ NM540 (ref λ -12) Δ ahn λ 3 t imm21 nin5 shn λ 6°Net for for HindIII fragments (18) λ NM540 (rpoD dnaG)St(att-red) Δ cl Δ (159λ+	$uvrA$ gal str (λind^{-})	9	
285c $F^- arg G lac thi rpoD285$ 5594str10BT308\beta^+thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (\lambda)7K1200endA rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101 $F^- arg G lac thi rpoD285(\beta^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- arg G lac thi rpoD285(\beta^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C $[\lambda gt7.(dnaG rpoD)St]$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°CPM106HfrC dnaG3 (\lambda^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with \lambda cryptic in gal T; supF (from RW842)13W3102\lambda^*14W3110thy15YmelsupF \lambda^*15Ymelb522 cl(shn\arbda+5)\anin5 (ara)coli6 b522 cl(shn\arbda+5) nin5Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lambdagt4*\lambdagt4S.(rpoD dnaG)St 1cl857 (sr1\arbda+2)\anin5 Sam100t\lambdagt4S.(rpoD dnaG)St 1cl857 (sr1\arbda+2)\anin5 Sam100t\lambdagt4S.(rpoD dnaG)St 2cl857 (sr1\arbda+2)\anin5 Sam100t\lambdagt4S.(rpoD dnaG)St 2cl857 (sr1\arbda+2)\anin5 sam100t\lambdagt4S.(rpoD dnaG)St 2cl857 (sr1\arbda+2)\anin5 sam100t\lambda NM540(sr1\albda+2)\anin5 sam100t\lambdamt62.(rpoD dnaG)St(sr1\albda+2)\anin5 sam100t\lambdamt62.(rpoD dnaG)St(att-red\albda\albda+1) nin5 (supF)Vector for Hind111 fragments (18)\lambdamt62.(rpoD dnaG)St(att-red\albda\albda+1) nin5t\lambdamt62.(rpoD dna	159λimm ²¹	$uvrA gal str (\lambda imm^{21})$	From 159 by lysogenization	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	285c	F^- argG lac thi rpoD285	5	
BT308λ+thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)7K1200endA rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C[\lag{t7-(dnaG rpoD)St]}From PC314 by lysogenizationPM106HfrC dnaG3 (\lambda^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with \lap{cryptic in galT;13supF (from RW842)15W3102\lap{8}*14W3110thy15YmelsupF \lap{8}*15Ymelb522 c1(shnA4-5) \alpha nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lap{44*\lap{45}(-rpoD dnaG)Stc1857 (srl\lap{1-2) \alpha nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lap{44*\lap{45-(rpoD dnaG)St1c1857 (srl\lap{1-2) \alpha nin5 Sam100t\lap{44S-(rpoD dnaG)St1(srl\lap{1-2) \alpha nin5 sim106This paper\lam{540}(srl1-2) \alpha nin3 sim26Vector for Hin	594	str	10	
K1200endA rna11PC314HfrC dnaG312PM101 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C [\lagkT-(dnaG rpoD)St]PM106HfrC dnaG3 (\lambda^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with \arryptic in galT; supF (from RW842)13W3102 λ^* 14W3110thy15YmelsupF \lagkS15Ymelb522 cl(shn\A-5)\arrow nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lagk44\lagkScl857 nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtScl857 (srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtScl857 (srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtS(srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtS(rpoD dnaG)St1cl857 (srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtS(rpoD dnaG)St2cl857 (srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 Sam100t\lagkAtS(rpoD dnaG)St2cl857 (srl\1-2)\arrow nin5 sam100t <td>ΒΤ308λ+</td> <td>thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)</td> <td>7</td>	ΒΤ308λ+	thy dnaG308 thi leu lac str (λ)	7	
$\begin{array}{cccc} PC314 & HfrC dnaG3 & 12 \\ PM101 & F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+) & From 285c by lysogenization \\ PM102 & F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+) & From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C \\ & [\lambdagt7-(dnaG rpoD)St] & \\ PM106 & HfrC dnaG3 (\lambda^+) & From PC314 by lysogenization \\ RW & HfrH with \lambda cryptic in galT, & 13 \\ & supF (from RW842) & \\ W3102 & \lambda^s & 14 \\ W3110 & thy & 15 \\ Ymel & supF \lambda^s & 15 \\ Pmages & \\ \lambdagt7 & b522 c1(shn\lambda4-5)\Delta nin5 (ara)coli6 & Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lambdagt4* (16) and the right arm of \lambdagt4 (16) and the right arm of \lambdagt4S (rpoD dnaG)St & c1857 (sr1\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100 & † \\ \lambdagt4S (rpoD dnaG)St & (sr1\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^{*} imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^{\circ} & Vector for HindIII fragments (18) \\ \lambdaNM540 & (sr1\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^{*} imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^{\circ} & This paper \\ \lambdaNM762 & (att-red)\Delta c1\Delta(KH54) nin5 & † \\ \lambdaNM762 (rpoD dnaG)Ec & (att-red)\Delta c1\Delta(KH54) nin5 & † \\ \lambdar6-(rp1 rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta c1\Delta(KH54) nin5 & 1 \\ \lambdar6-(rp1 rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta c1\Delta(KH54) nin5 & 20 \\ \end{array}$	K1200	endA rna	11	
PM101 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From 285c by lysogenizationPM102 $F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C $[\lambda gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St]$ From PC314 by lysogenizationPM106HfrC dnaG3 (\lambda^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in gal7;13 $supF$ (from RW842)14W3102 λ^{s} 14W3110thy15YmelsupF λ^{s} 15Ymelb522 c I(shn\lambda4-5) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from λ gt4* λ gt4Scl857 nin5 Sam100t λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 1cl857 (srl\lambda1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 2cl857 (srl\lambda1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t λ NM540(srl\lambda1-2) Δ shn λ^3 timm21 nin5 shn λ^{60} Vector for HindIII fragments (18)NNM540-(rpoD dnaG)St(srl\lambda1-2) Δ shn λ^3 timm21 nin5 shn λ^{60} Vector for HindIII fragments (19) λ NM762(att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t λ R64(att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t	PC314	HfrC dnaG3	12	
PM102 $F^- arg G lac thi rpoD285(\lambda^+)$ [$\lambda gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St$]From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at 42°C [$\lambda gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St$]PM106HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in galT; supF (from RW842)13W3102 λ^{s} 14W3110thy15YmelsupF λ^{s} 15YmelsupF λ^{s} 15Variableb522 c1(shn $\lambda 4.5$) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^{*}$ $\lambda gt45$ c1857 nin5 Sam100t $\lambda gt4S$ c1857 (srI λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t $\lambda gt4S$ -(rpoD dnaG)St 1c1857 (srI λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t $\lambda gt4S$ -(rpoD dnaG)St 2c1857 (srI λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t $\lambda gt4S$ -(rpoD dnaG)St 3(srI λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t $\lambda gt4S$ -(rpoD dnaG)St 4(srI λ 1-2) Δ nin5 Sam100t $\lambda nM540$ (srI λ 1-2) Δ shn $\lambda^3 t$ imm21 nin5 shn λ^{60} Vector for HindIII fragments (18) $\lambda NM540$ (srI λ 1-2) Δ shn $\lambda^3 t$ imm21 nin5 shn λ^{60} Vector for HindIII fragments (19) $\lambda NM762$ (att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t $\lambda NM762$ (att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t $\lambda red \Delta$ (att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t $\lambda red \Delta$ (att-red) Δ cl Δ (KH54) nin5t	PM101	F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(λ^+)	From 285c by lysogenization	
PM106HrC $dnaG3(\lambda^+)$ From PC314 by lysogenizationRWHfrH with λ cryptic in $galT$; $supF$ (from RW842)13W3102 λ^* 14W3110thy15Ymel $supF \lambda^*$ 15Ymel $b522 cI(shn\lambda4.5)\Delta nin5 (ara)coli6$ Vector for $EcoRI$ fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^*$ $\lambda gt7$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda4.5) \Delta nin5 (ara)coli6$ Vector for $EcoRI$ fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^*$ $\lambda gt7$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda4.5) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda gt4S$ $c1857 nin5 Sam100$ $EcoRI$ vector carrying the left arm of $\lambda gt4$ (16) and the right arm of $\lambda gtWES-\lambda B$ (17) [†] $\lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St 1$ $c1857 (srI\lambda1.2)\Delta nin5 Sam100$ \dagger $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda1.2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ$ Vector for HindIII fragments (18) $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda1.2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ$ This paper $\lambda NM762$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda NM762$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda 76 - (rpl rpoBC)Ec$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ 20	PM102	F^- argG lac thi rpoD285(λ^+) [λ gt7-(dnaG rpoD)St]	From PM101 by transduction, selecting for growth at $42^{\circ}C$	
RWHfrH with λ cryptic in galT; supF (from RW842)13W3102 λ^{s} 14W3100thy15YmelsupF λ^{s} 15YmelsupF λ^{s} 15Variationb522 cI(shn $\lambda 4$ -5) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from λ gt4* λ gt7b522 cI(shn $\lambda 4$ -5) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from λ gt4* λ gt7b522 cI(shn $\lambda 4$ -5) α nin5† λ gt4ScI857 nin5 Sam100to cI857 nin5 Sam100 λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 1cI857 (srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ nin5 Sam100† λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 2cI857 (srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ nin5 Sam100to cI857 (srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ nin5 Sam100 λ gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 1cI857 (srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ nin5 Sam100to cI857 (srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ nin5 Sam100 λ nM540(srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ shn $\lambda 3^{+}$ imm21 nin5 shn λ 6°Vector for HindIII fragments (18) λ NM540(srI $\lambda 1$ -2) Δ shn $\lambda 3^{+}$ imm21 nin5 shn λ 6°This paper λ NM762(att-red) Δ cI Δ (KH54) nin5 (supF)Vector for HindIII fragments (19) λ NM762-(rpoD dnaG)Ec(att-red) Δ cI Δ (KH54) nin5to cI Δ λ rG-(rpl rpoBC)Ec(att-red) Δ cI Δ (KH54) nin520	PM106	HfrC dnaG3 (λ^+)	From PC314 by lysogenization	
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	RW	HfrH with λ cryptic in galT; supF (from RW842)	13	
$ \begin{array}{lllllll} W3110 & thy & 15 \\ ymel & supF \lambda^s & 15 \\ & Phages \\ \hline \lambda gt7 & b522 c I(shn\lambda 4-5) \Delta nin5 (ara)coli6 & Vector for EcoRI fragments derived from \lambda gt4* \\ \lambda gt7 & b522 c I(shn\lambda 4-5) nin5 & t \\ \lambda gt4S & c I857 nin5 Sam100 & EcoRI vector carrying the left arm of \lambda gt4 (16) and the right \\ arm of \lambda gtWES \cdot \lambda B (17)^{\dagger} \\ \lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St & c I857 (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta nin5 Sam100 & t \\ \lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St & c I857 (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta nin5 Sam100 & t \\ \lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St & c I857 (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta nin5 Sam100 & t \\ \lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St & c I857 (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta nin5 Sam100 & t \\ \lambda mM540 & (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta shn\lambda^3 + imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ & Vector for HindIII fragments (18) \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ & This paper \\ \lambda NM540 - (rpoD dnaG)St & (srI\lambda1-2) \Delta c I \Delta (KH54) nin5 & t \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red) \Delta c I \Delta (KH54) nin5 & t \\ \lambda 76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec & (att-red) \Delta c I \Delta (KH54) nin5 & t \\ \end{array}$	W3102	λ^{s}	14	
Ymel $supF \lambda^s$ 15 Phages $\lambda gt7$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda 4.5) \Delta nin5 (ara)coli6$ Vector for $EcoRI$ fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^*$ $\lambda gt7$ - $(rpoD dnaG)St$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda 4.5) nin5 (ara)coli6$ Vector for $EcoRI$ fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^*$ $\lambda gt4S$ $cI857 nin5 Sam100$ t $\lambda gt4S$ - $(rpoD dnaG)St1$ $cI857 (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100$ t $\lambda gt4S$ - $(rpoD dnaG)St2$ $cI857 (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100$ t $\lambda gt4S$ - $(rpoD dnaG)St2$ $cI857 (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100$ t $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ$ Vector for HindIII fragments (18) $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ$ This paper $\lambda NM762$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5 (supF)$ Vector for HindIII fragments (19) $\lambda NM762$ - $(rpoD dnaG)Ec$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ t $\lambda 76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec$ $(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ 20	W3110	thy	15	
$\begin{array}{lllllll} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	Ymel	$supF \lambda^s$	15	
$\lambda gt7$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda 4.5) \Delta nin5 (ara)coli6$ Vector for $EcoRI$ fragments derived from $\lambda gt4^*$ $\lambda gt7$ - $(rpoD dnaG)St$ $b522 cI(shn\lambda 4.5) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda gt4S$ $cI857 nin5 Sam100$ $EcoRI$ vector carrying the left arm of $\lambda gt4$ (16) and the right arm of $\lambda gtWES \cdot \lambda B$ (17) \dagger $\lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St 1$ $cI857 (srI\lambda 1.2) \Delta nin5 Sam100$ \dagger $\lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St 2$ $cI857 (srI\lambda 1.2) \Delta nin5 Sam100$ \dagger $\lambda gt4S - (rpoD dnaG)St 2$ $cI857 (srI\lambda 1.2) \Delta nin5 Sam100$ \dagger $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda 1.2) \Delta shn\lambda 3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda 6^\circ$ Vector for HindIII fragments (18) $\lambda NM540$ $(srI\lambda 1.2) \Delta shn\lambda 3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda 6^\circ$ Vector for HindIII fragments (19) $\lambda NM762$ $(att-red) \Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda NM762$ $(att-red) \Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ \dagger $\lambda 76 - (rpl rpoBC)Ec$ $(att-red) \Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$ \dagger	Phages			
$\begin{array}{lllllll} \lambda gt7-(rpoD\ dnaG)St & b522\ cI(shn\lambda4-5)\ nin5 & \dagger & cI857\ nin5\ Sam100 & EcoRI\ vector\ carrying\ the\ left\ arm\ of\ \lambda gtWES\cdot\lambdaB\ (17)^{\dagger} & \\ \lambda gt4S & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & \dagger & \\ \lambda gt4S-(rpoD\ dnaG)St & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & \dagger & \\ \lambda gt4S-(rpoD\ dnaG)St & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & \dagger & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & Vector\ for\ HindIII\ fragments\ (18) & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & \\ \lambda NM562 & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ (supF) & Vector\ for\ HindIIII\ fragments\ (19) & \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ & \\ \lambda 76-(rpl\ rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ & \\ 20 & \end{array}$	λgt7	b522 cI(shn λ 4-5) Δ nin5 (ara)coli6	Vector for <i>Eco</i> RI fragments derived from λ gt4*	
$\lambda gt4S$ $c I857 nin5 Sam100$ $EcoRI vector carrying the left arm of \lambda gt4 (16) and the rightarm of \lambda gtWES \cdot \lambda B (17)†\lambda gt4S \cdot (rpoD dnaG)St 1c I857 (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100†\lambda gt4S \cdot (rpoD dnaG)St 2c I857 (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta nin5 Sam100†\lambda NM540(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circVector for HindIII fragments (18)\lambda NM540 \cdot (rpoD dnaG)St(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circThis paper\lambda NM540 \cdot (rpoD dnaG)St(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circVector for HindIII fragments (18)\lambda NM540 \cdot (rpoD dnaG)St(srI\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circThis paper\lambda NM762 \cdot (att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5 (supF)Vector for HindIII fragments (19)\lambda NM762 \cdot (rpoD dnaG)Ec(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5†\lambda 76 \cdot (rpl rpoBC)Ec(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin520$	$\lambda gt7$ -(rpoD dnaG)St	b522 cI(shnλ4-5) nin5	t	
$\begin{array}{lll} \lambda gt4S-(rpoD\ dnaG)St\ 1 & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & \dagger \\ \lambda gt4S-(rpoD\ dnaG)St\ 2 & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & \dagger \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & Vector\ for\ HindIII\ fragments\ (18) \\ \lambda NM540-(rpoD\ dnaG)St & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^{+}\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^{\circ} & This\ paper \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ (supF) & Vector\ for\ HindIII\ fragments\ (19) \\ \lambda NM762-(rpoD\ dnaG)Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 & \dagger \\ \lambda 76-(rpl\ rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 & 20 \\ \end{array}$	$\lambda gt4S$	c1857 nin5 Sam100	EcoRI vector carrying the left arm of λ gt4 (16) and the right arm of λ gtWES· λ B (17) [†]	
$\begin{array}{lll} \lambda gt4S-(rpoD\ dnaG)St\ 2 & cI857\ (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ nin5\ Sam100 & ^\dagger \\ \lambda NM540 & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^+\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^\circ \\ \lambda NM540-(rpoD\ dnaG)St & (srI\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^+\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^\circ \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ (supF) & Vector\ for\ HindIII\ fragments\ (19) \\ \lambda NM762-(rpoD\ dnaG)Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 & ^\dagger \\ \lambda 76-(rpl\ rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cI\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 & 20 \\ \end{array}$	λgt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 1	c1857 (srIλ1-2)Δ nin5 Sam100	t	
$\begin{array}{lll} \lambda NM540 & (srl\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ & Vector for HindIII fragments (18) \\ \lambda NM540-(rpoD dnaG)St & (srl\lambda1-2)\Delta shn\lambda3^+ imm21 nin5 shn\lambda6^\circ & This paper \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red)\Delta cl\Delta(KH54) nin5 (supF) & Vector for HindIII fragments (19) \\ \lambda NM762-(rpoD dnaG)Ec & (att-red)\Delta cl\Delta(KH54) nin5 & \dagger \\ \lambda 76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec & (att-red)\Delta cl\Delta(KH54) nin5 & 20 \end{array}$	$\lambda gt4S-(rpoD dnaG)St 2$	c1857 (srIλ1-2)Δ nin5 Sam100	t	
$\begin{array}{lll} \lambda NM540-(rpoD\ dnaG) St & (srl\lambda1-2)\Delta\ shn\lambda3^+\ imm21\ nin5\ shn\lambda6^\circ \\ \lambda NM762 & (att-red)\Delta\ cl\Delta(KH54)\ nin5\ (supF) \\ \lambda NM762-(rpoD\ dnaG) Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cl\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 \\ \lambda 76-(rpl\ rpoBC) Ec & (att-red)\Delta\ cl\Delta(KH54)\ nin5 \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	λ NM540	(srIλ1-2)Δ shnλ3+ imm21 nin5 shnλ6°	Vector for <i>Hin</i> dIII fragments (18)	
λ NM762(att-red) Δ c I Δ(KH54) nin5 (supF)Vector for HindIII fragments (19) λ NM762-(rpoD dnaG)Ec(att-red) Δ c I Δ(KH54) nin5† λ 76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec(att-red) Δ c I Δ(KH54) nin520	$\lambda NM540$ -(rpoD dnaG)St	$(srI\lambda 1-2)\Delta shn\lambda 3^+ imm 21 nin 5 shn\lambda 6^\circ$	This paper	
$ \begin{array}{ll} \lambda NM762 - (rpoD dnaG) Ec & (att-red) \Delta c I \Delta (KH54) nin5 & \dagger \\ \lambda 76 - (rpl rpoBC) Ec & (att-red) \Delta c I \Delta (KH54) nin5 & 20 \end{array} $	λNM762	$(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5 (supF)$	Vector for <i>Hin</i> dIII fragments (19)	
λ 76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec (att-red) Δ cI Δ (KH54) nin5 20	$\lambda NM762$ -(rpoD dnaG)Ec	$(att-red)\Delta cI\Delta(KH54) nin5$	t	
	λ76-(rpl rpoBC)Ec	(att-red) Δ cI Δ (KH54) nin5	20	

All bacterial strains are derivatives of E. coli K-12. Nomenclature follows that of Bachmann et al. (21). The mutations rpoD285, dnaG3, and dnaG308 are temperature-sensitive. Restriction targets are designated srI λ (EcoRI) and shn λ (HindIII) (19). St and Ec denote DNA derived from S. typhimurium and E. coli, respectively.

Gift from R. W. Davis and M. Thomas.

[†] To be described elsewhere.

which phage genes are repressed) to make large quantities of a σ -sized protein (Fig. 2, lane a). The same fragment recloned in both possible orientations into another λ vector also made this protein (Fig. 2, lanes b and c; see also Fig. 4, lanes a and g). Phage λ itself did not make such a protein, nor did $\lambda 76(rpl$ rpoBC)Ec which does not have the rpoD dnaG fragment (Fig. 2. lane d). The σ subunit of S. typhimurium polymerase has a lesser mobility on NaDodSO₄/polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis than does that of E. coli (1, 2). This difference, detectable on 15% gels, is indicated (σ_s and σ_c) on Fig. 2. The heavily labeled band coded by the EcoRI fragment ran closer to the position of marker σ from S. typhimurium. This indication is strongly confirmed in the results reported below.

RNA polymerase was purified from a strain, PM101, containing rpoD285 and lysogenic for the transducing phage $\lambda gt7$ -(rpoD dnaG)St. If the fragment-coded protein is σ , then at least some of the enzyme from this lysogen should yield σ with the mobility characteristic of the S. typhimurium subunit. The greater part of the pure enzyme had this property (Fig. 3, lane a). It migrated behind the mutant σ from E. coli rpoD285 and wild-type E. coli σ (Fig. 3, lanes b and c) but at the same rate as σ purified from S. *typhimurium* (Fig. 3, lane d). Another polymerase preparation from this strain (not shown) contained both mutant-sized and S. typhimurium-sized σ , predominantly the latter.

Our combined observations show that the EcoRI fragment has a functional rpoD gene from S. typhimurium able to complement a σ mutation in *E. coli*.

To discover whether the EcoRI fragment has an active gene able to compensate dnaG3 we analyzed temperature-resistant

transductants of the mutant PM106. Transductants containing $\lambda NM762$ -(rpoD dnaG)Ec, $\lambda gt7$ -(rpoD dnaG)St, or λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 2 (Table 1) were each cured of the phage by heteroimmune superinfection. They become temperature-sensitive after curing. We infer that the EcoRI fragment has an intact and functional gene, probably dnaG from S. typhimurium, able to complement dnaG3. Interestingly, UVirradiated cells infected with $\lambda gt7-(rpoD \ dnaG)St$ or λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 2 did not synthesize detectable amounts of a protein migrating with primase marker from E. coli (Fig. 2).

Other Proteins Determined by the Cloned EcoRI Fragment. We observed two other proteins in UV-irradiated cells infected with $\lambda gt7$ -(*rpoD dnaG*)St, $\lambda gt4S$ -(*rpoD dnaG*)St 1, or λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 2. In λ -lysogenic bacteria we detected a band, X1, at 58,000 daltons (Fig. 2). We are not yet convinced that this protein, which is not detected in cells labeled very soon after infection (Fig. 4), is the primary product of a gene on the EcoRI fragment. By contrast, we shall present evidence (see below) that the fragment does code for a 34,000-dalton protein, P-34, which can be seen when λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 2 infects nonlysogenic cells (Fig. 4, lane h). Significantly, λ gt4S-(*rpoD* dnaG)St 1, an identical phage with the EcoRI fragment in reverse orientation, did not make P-34 in nonlysogenic cells. Neither phage made the protein in λ -lysogenic bacteria. These combined observations suggest that the gene is using a phage promoter.

The E. coli HindIII Fragment Carries rpoD. The phage λNM762-(*rpoD dnaG*)Ec has a 9-kb *E*. *coli Hin*dIII fragment (see above). It transduced PM101 (rpoD285) to ts⁺ at the same



FIG. 1. Hybridization analysis of restriction fragments from E. coli and S. typhimurium. ³²P-Labeled probe was prepared by treating $\lambda gt7-(rpoD dnaG)$ St with EcoRI and electrophoretic purification of the cloned S. typhimurium rpoD-dnaG fragment, which was labeled by nick translation (25). DNA samples were electrophoresed in 0.5% agarose gel for 16 hr at 25 V and transferred to Schleicher & Schuell nitrocellulose sheet (25). The DNA samples on nitrocellulose were then hybridized with the probe for 18 hr at 44°C in 10 ml of 50% formamide/60 mM NaCl/40 mM NaH₂PO₄, pH 7/4 mM EDTA/0.3% sodium dodecyl sulfate (NaDodSO₄)/calf thymus DNA (0.5 mg/ml) containing 10 ng of probe per ml (10⁵ cpm/ml). Hybridized bands were visualized by autoradiography (2-day exposure). Lanes: a, $\lambda gt7$ -(rpoD dnaG)St DNA (5 ng) cleaved with EcoRI; b, S. typhimurium LT2 DNA (1 μ g) cleaved with EcoRI; c, λ NM762-(rpoD dnaG)Ec DNA (5 ng) cleaved with HindIII; d, E. coli DNA (1 µg) cleaved with HindIII. Complete genotype of phages carrying rpoD and dnaG genes is given in Table 1.

frequency (one to five transductants per 10³ plaque-forming particles) as did λ gt7-(*rpoD dnaG*)St, containing the S. *typhimurium Eco*RI fragment. It also transduced BT308 λ^+ (*dnaG*308) to ts⁺ (at a somewhat lower frequency), leading to the conclusion that λ NM762-(*rpoD dnaG*)Ec carries the *dnaG rpoD* segment of the *E. coli* chromosome. Our conclusion is strongly supported by the fact that λ NM762-(*rpoD dnaG*)Ec directs UV-irradiated cells to make a protein with the mobility of marker σ from *Escherichia coli* (Fig. 2, lane f). This technique has not revealed any other *E. coli* protein determined by the *Hin*dIII fragment. Because we do not find a protein of the mobility of DNA primase in polyacrylamide gels, we cannot be sure that this fragment includes the entire *dnaG* gene.

The Genetic Organization of the *rpoD-dnaG* Segment. In order to provide points of reference in the *rpoD-dnaG* region of the genome, a restriction nuclease cleavage map was constructed by digesting the DNA of the transducing phages with several restriction enzymes and comparing the products of single and double digestions. The results of these experiments are presented in Fig. 5. The alignment of the *E. coli* and *S. typhimurium* genomes is based on the analysis of heteroduplex molecules formed between λ NM540-(*rpoD dnaG*)Ec and λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 1, which show homology of 6 kb to the left of the right of the leftward *Hind*III site (S. Scherer, personal communication). The location of *rpoD* and *dnaG* on the S.



FIG. 2. Long-term labeling of cloned gene products in UV-irradiated lysogenic bacteria. L-broth-grown bacteria $(2 \times 10^8/\text{ml})$ were prepared, irradiated, infected, labeled with [35S]methionine, and lysed according to Messer et al. (26). Irradiated bacteria were infected at a multiplicity of 5-10, grown at 37°C for 20 min, labeled with [35S] methionine (10 μ Ci/ml; approximately 750 Ci/mmol; 1 Ci = 3.7 × 10¹⁰ becquerels) for 40 min and chased (4 min) by 1:40 dilution with unlabeled methionine. The extracts $(5-50 \mu l, providing approximately$ 10⁵ cpm per sample) were electrophoresed on a 12% NaDodSO₄/ polyacrylamide gel (27) for 4 hr at 35 mA after the stacking process had been completed. The stained gel was dried and autoradiographed (20) for 2 days. Lanes: a, $\lambda gt7-(rpoD \ dnaG)St$; b, $\lambda gt4S-(rpoD \ dn$ dnaG)St 1; c, λ gt4S-(*rpoD* dnaG)St2; d, λ 76; e, uninfected cells; f, λ NM762-(rpoD dnaG)Ec. Stained markers [σ_s from S. typhimurium and σ_c and primase (dnaG) from E. coli] were traced onto the autoradiogram after processing. A long exposure (9 days) still showed only $\sigma_{\rm c}$ in lane f.

typhimurium genome was determined by analysis of spontaneous deletions of the transducing phages. The deletions were selected from two phage stocks. One, λ gt4S-($rpoD \ dnaG$)St 2, has its fragment inserted into λ in the orientation shown. The fragment is reversed in the other phage, λ gt4S-($rpoD \ dnaG$)St 1, which is otherwise identical. Deletion phages, selected as survivors of heat-shock treatment (31), were analyzed for restriction sites and transducing ability. Four types of deletion pinpoint the rpoD and dnaG genes on the fragment. Deletions of λ gt4S-($rpoD \ dnaG$)St 1— Δ 1-1, Δ 1-3, and Δ 1-6—show that the genes are in the right half of the fragment. Two of them (Δ 1-3 and Δ 1-6) cut into rpoD. These deletion phages make no σ in UV-irradiated bacteria (Fig. 4, lanes e and f) but instead make a new protein 9/10th the size of σ , which could be a large NH₂-terminal fragment of the subunit.

Deletions of λ gt4S-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 2 (Δ 2-5 and Δ 2-7) order *rpoD* and *dnaG*. In addition, Δ 2-7 behaves unusually in UVirradiated bacteria (Fig. 4, lanes k and l). It makes about onefifth the amount of σ (according to densitometer tracings) than



FIG. 3. NaDodSO₄/polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of RNA polymerase performed as described by Harris et al. (2). RNA polymerase was purified by the procedure of Burgess and Jendrisak (28) with modifications for smaller quantities of cells (2). The gel contained 7.5% acrylamide and was 20 cm long. The positions of the RNA polymerase subunits are indicated at the right. Lanes: a, RNA polymerase isolated from the coli 285c derivative strain PM102, which carries the rpoD gene of S. typhimurium; b, RNA polymerase from the parent strain 285c; c, RNA polymerase from E. coli strain K1200; d, RNA polymerase from S. typhimurium (gift of M. Chamberlin).

does the parent phage in lysogenic bacteria. This suggests that it has lost an element necessary for its expression, probably the promoter. However, in nonlysogenic bacteria it makes at least as much σ as does the parent (Fig. 4, lanes l and h). In this orientation, deletion past the *Eco*RI junction connects the bacterial DNA to the strong leftward promoter, P_L, of phage λ (32), which could permit read through to *rpoD*.

Thus, the properties of these deletions strongly suggest that rpoD is transcribed leftward (i.e., clockwise) on the map of S. typhimurium. Moreover, the fact that $\Delta 2$ -7 does make some σ -sized protein in lysogenic bacteria suggests that its promoter is only partly deleted, arguing that this element lies between rpoD and dnaG. Alternatively, $\Delta 2$ -7 could end within dnaG, eliminating a major upstream promoter for rpoD but leaving intact a minor promoter between the two structural genes.

Although the genetic evidence shows that the cloned S. typhimurium dnaG gene is complete and active in E. coli we have not seen its product in UV-irradiated bacteria. P-34 cannot be the dnaG product because it is not made by a phage, λ NM540-(*rpoD dnaG*)St 1, that contains the *Hind*III subfragment oriented leftward (data not shown). This phage can complement a dnaG3 mutant. For this reason we have placed the gene for P-34 at the extreme right of the cloned EcoRI fragment.

DISCUSSION

Cloning and Expression of *rpoD*. Previous evidence for the location of *rpoD* was based on electrophoretic differences between σ proteins from different strains of enteric bacteria (1, 2) as well as the mapping of temperature-sensitivity and specificity mutations (3–6). Although these results could be due to modification of σ by a gene mapping at 66 min, the cloning results described here show unequivocally that the structural gene coding for S. *typhimurium* σ protein maps at 66 min.



FIG. 4. Short-term labeling of UV-irradiated lysogenic and nonlysogenic bacteria with $\lambda(rpoD \, dnaG)$ phages and deletion mutants. Maltose-induced, broth-grown bacteria (159 and 159 λ^+) were prepared by the method of C. Epp and M. Pearson (personal communication). Bacteria at about 10⁸ per ml were concentrated 10-fold in minimal medium (26), UV-irradiated (5000 ergs/mm²), and infected with phage at 4°C for 30 min (multiplicity, 5-10) before dilution 1:5 into fresh minimal medium containing [35 S]methionine (50 μ Ci/ml). After 10-min labeling, we added NaN₃ (final concentration, 50 mM) and poured the mixture over ice. The cells were pelleted at 4°C and treated as described in the legend to Fig. 2. Extracts from lysogenic $(159\lambda^+)$ and nonlysogenic (159) bacteria are in adjacent lanes. The positions at which bovine serum albumin (BSA), the α subunit of E. coli RNA polymerase, and myoglobin appeared on the destained gel are indicated. Lanes: a, $\lambda gt4S(rpoD dnaG)St 1$, $159\lambda^+$; b, $\lambda gt4S(rpoD dnaG)St 1$, $159\lambda^+$; b, $\lambda gt4S(rpoD dnaG)St 1$, $\lambda gt4S(rpoD dnaG)S$ dnaG)St 1, 159; c, $\Delta 1$ -1, 159 λ^+ ; d, $\Delta 1$ -1, 159; e, $\Delta 1$ -3, 159 λ^+ ; f, $\Delta 1$ -3, 159; g, λ gt4S(rpoD dnaG)St 2, 159 λ ⁺; h, λ gt4S(rpoD dnaG)St 2, 159; i, Δ2-5, 159λ⁺; j, Δ2-5, 159; k, Δ2-7, 159λ⁺; l, Δ2-7, 159; m, λNM762(rpoD dnaG)Ec, 159λ⁺; n, λNM762(rpoD dnaG)Ec, 159.

Deletion mapping shows that the dnaG and rpoD genes are adjacent. The rpoD gene is transcribed clockwise on the Salmonella chromosome (33) from a promoter that probably lies between dnaG and rpoD. The evidence suggests that P-34 is also transcribed clockwise. However, because we do not see a protein of the size expected for primase, we are unable to determine the direction of transcription of dnaG.

Synthesis of σ subunit in *E. coli* is markedly derepressed by the *N* gene product of phage λ . This protein reverses some termination signals for transcription and thus allows readthrough into adjacent genes (34). Perhaps σ synthesis is regulated by an anti-termination mechanism (35).

The $\lambda(rpoD)$ phages reported here have the dual capacity to synthesize N protein and σ from the cloned DNA. Furthermore, σ synthesis can be observed in the presence (in nonlysogenic bacteria) and absence (in lysogenic bacteria) of the N protein. We have not found derepression of σ labeling after infection of UV-irradiated bacteria (see Fig. 4). It will be interesting to discover whether this difference is due to the absence of a promoter and N-reversible termination site from the



piece of DNA which we have cloned from E. coli. It is of course possible that S. typhimurium does not have N-reversible termination sites.

Evolutionary Conservation of the rpoD Gene. Wiggs et al. (36) have shown that RNA polymerases from a wide variety of unrelated bacterial species all recognize the same promoters on coliphage T7 DNA. These authors argue that a great divergence of promoter specificity would hinder the evolutionary process. Consistent with such conservation of promoter specificity in vitro, we have found that the σ subunit of S. typhimurium can substitute for E. coli σ in PM101 (rpoD285) and remains associated with E. coli core enzyme through many steps of purification (Fig. 3). These observations are borne out by the fact that the rpoD genes from these two enteric bacteria show considerable homology in nucleotide sequence (Fig. 1; S. Scherer, personal communication), although in general the bacterial DNA sequences show significant diversity (37). Labeled restriction fragments of *rpoD* may provide an effective probe to identify the rpoD genes of less-related bacterial species.

The excellent technical assistance of Audrey Nolte, the advice of Walt Ream and Dan Schindler, and the encouragement of Arthur Kornberg are greatly appreciated. This research was supported by National Institutes of Health Research Grant AI 08722 from the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, by Research Grant VC-188 from the American Cancer Society, and by National Science Foundation Research Grant PCM 76-19935.

- Nakamura, Y., Osawa, T. & Yura, T. (1977) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 1. USA 74, 1831-1835.
- Harris, J. D., Martinez, I. I. & Calendar, R. (1977) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 74, 1836-1840. 2
- Gross, C., Hoffman, J., Ward, C., Hager, D., Burdick, G., Berger, H. & Burgess, R. (1978) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 75, 427-3. 431.
- Travers, A. A., Buckland, R., Goman, M., Le Grice, S. S. G. & 4. Scaife, J. G. (1978) Nature (London) 273, 354–358. Harris, J. D., Heilig, J. S., Martinez, I. I., Calendar, R. & Isaksson,
- 5. L. A. (1978) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 75, 6177-6181.
- Nakamura, Y. (1978) Mol. Gen. Genet. 165, 1-6.
- Wechsler, J. A. & Gross, J. D. (1971) Mol. Gen. Genet. 113, 7 273 - 284
- Rowen, L. & Kornberg, A. (1978) J. Biol. Chem. 253, 758-8. 764
- Ptashne, M. (1967) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 57, 306-313. 9.

FIG. 5. Map of the S. typhimurium and E. coli genomes in the dnaG rpoD region. The restriction enzyme cleavage sites were determined with $\lambda gt7$ -(rpoD dnaG)St and $\lambda NM762$ -(rpoD dnaG)Ec. We indicate two possible locations for one of the Sal cleavage sites. The alignment of the E. coli and S. typhimurium genome fragments is based on heteroduplex analysis of $\lambda gt4S-(rpoD)$ dnaG)St1 and λ NM540-(rpoD dnaG)Ec, which show homology of 6 kb extending from the right HindIII site and 1.5 kb extending from the left HindIII site (S. Scherer, personal communication). The parentheses enclose the deleted S. typhimurium DNA. These deletions locate the positions of the genes. Deletions $\Delta 1$ -1, $\Delta 1$ -3, and $\Delta 1$ -6 were selected from λ gt4S-(dnaG rpoD)St 1 and deletions $\Delta 2$ -5 and $\Delta 2$ -7 were selected from $\lambda gt4S(dnaG rpoD)St 2$ by heating phage suspensions in 20 mM EDTA (29). They all leave the phage int and xis genes intact. Some delete the righthand EcoRI bacterialphage joint and are presumed to arise at att (30). The others are internal deletions of the cloned DNA. We indicate the ability of each phage to transduce PM101 and PM106 (Table 1) to temperature resistance.

- Campbell, A. (1965) Virology 27, 329-339.
- 10. Durwald, H. & Hoffmann-Berling, H. (1968) J. Mol. Biol. 31. 11. 334-346
- 12 Bowden, D. W., Twersky, R. S. & Calendar, R. (1975) J. Bacteriol. 124, 167-175.
- Enquist, L. W. & Weisberg, R. A. (1976) Virology 72, 147-13. 153
- Echols, H. & Green, L. (1971) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 68, 14. 2190-2194
- Bachmann, B. J. (1972) Bacteriol. Rev. 36, 525-557. 15.
- Panasenko, S. M., Cameron, J. R., Davis, R. W. & Lehman, I. R. 16. (1977) Science 196, 188–189.
- Leder, P., Tiemer, D. & Enquist, L. (1977) Science 196, 175-17. 177.
- 18. Borck, K., Beggs, J. D., Brammar, W. J., Hopkins, A. S. & Murray, N. (1976) Mol. Gen. Genet. 146, 199-207.
- Murray, N. E., Brammar, W. J. & Murray, K. (1977) Mol. Gen. 19 Genet. 150, 53-61
- Linn, T. & Scaife, J. G. (1978) Nature (London) 276, 33-37. 20.
- Bachmann, B. J., Low, K. B. & Taylor, A. L. (1976) Bacteriol. Rev. 21. 40, 116-167.
- Hohn, B. & Murray, K. (1977) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 74, 22 3259-3263
- 23 Benton, W. D. & Davis, R. W. (1977) Science 186, 180-182.
- Harris, J. D. & Calendar, R. (1978) Virology 85, 343-358. 24.
- Southern, E. M. (1975) J. Mol. Biol. 98, 503-517 25.
- Messer, W., Bergmans, H., Meijer, M., Womack, J. E., Hansen, 26. F. G. & von Meyenberg, K. (1978) Mol. Gen Genet. 162, 269-275.
- Laemmli, U. K. (1970) Nature (London) 227, 680-689. 27.
- Burgess, R. R. & Jendrisak, J. J. (1975) Biochemistry 14, 4634-28. 4638
- 29 Shigeru, S. & Uchida, H. (1977) Virology 83, 277-286.
- Davis, R. W. & Parkinson, J. S. (1971) J. Mol. Biol. 56, 403-30. 423
- Parkinson, J. S. & Huskey, R. J. (1971) J. Mol. Biol. 56, 369-31. 384.
- Rosenberg, M., Court, D., Shimatake, H., Brady, C. & Wulff, D. 32. (1978) in The Operon, eds. Miller, J. & Reznikoff, W. (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY), pp. 345-371.
- Sanderson, K. E. & Hartman, P. E. (1978) Microbiol. Rev. 42, 33. 471-519
- Roberts, J. W. (1976) in RNA Polymerase, eds. Losick, R. & 34. Chamberlin, M. J. (Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, Cold Spring Harbor, NY), pp. 247-272.
- Nakamura, Y. & Yura, T. (1976) Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 73, 35. 4405-4409.
- Wiggs, J., Bush, J. & Chamberlin, M. (1979) Cell 16, 97-109. 36.
- Brenner, D. & Falkow, S. (1971) Adv. Gen. 16, 81-118. 37.