The Two Embryonic U1 Small Nuclear RNAs of Xenopus laevis Are Encoded by a Major Family of Tandemly Repeated Genes

ELSEBET LUND,¹ JAMES E. DAHLBERG,^{1*} AND DOUGLASS J. FORBES²⁺

Department of Physiological Chemistry, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706,¹ and Department of Biophysics and Biochemistry, University of California-San Francisco, San Francisco, California 94143

Received 3 July 1984/Accepted 30 August 1984

We have identified a large family of U1 RNA genes in Xenopus laevis that encodes two distinct species of U1 RNA. These genes are expressed primarily at the onset of transcription in the 4,000-cell embryo (D. J. Forbes, M. W. Kirschner, D. Caput, J. E. Dahlberg, and E. Lund, Cell 38:681-689, 1984). The two types of embryonic Ul RNA genes are interspersed and are organized in large tandem arrays. The basic 1.9-kilobase repeating unit contains a single copy of each of the embryonic genes and is reiterated ca. 500-fold per haploid genome. This repetitive U1 DNA accounts for more than 90% of all U1 DNA in X. laevis. In addition to this major family, there exist several minor families of dispersed Ul RNA genes, which presumably encode the oocyte and somatic species of X. laevis U1 RNA. Although the embryonic genes are normally inactive in stage VI oocytes, they are expressed when cloned copies are injected into oocyte nuclei.

The Ul small nuclear RNA (Ul RNA), which is ubiquitous in higher eucaryotes, is encoded by multigene families. The estimates for gene copy number range from ca. 5 to 50 per haploid genome in Drosophila (S. M. Mount, Ph.D. thesis, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 1983) sea urchin (5), chicken (24), rodent (16, 30), and human (9, 14, 15) DNAs. In spite of this multiplicity of genes, only one or two Ul RNA species have been detected in each of these organisms. In vertebrates, the majority of the Ul RNA genes appears to be dispersed in the genome but, at least in the case of humans, they are clustered in a small region of a single chromosome (13). In the sea urchin genome, all of the genes for Ni RNA (the equivalent of Ul RNA) are arranged in a single large tandem array (5). Mammalian genomes also contain several classes of abundant Ul RNA pseudogenes (8, 9, 15, 18, 21), whereas the sea urchin genome apparently does not (5).

It has been reported elsewhere that Xenopus laevis DNA encodes at least seven different Ul RNA species and that the transcription of several Ul RNA genes is under developmental control (10a). That is the first demonstration of controlled expression of Ul RNA genes. In particular, we find that two species of *Xenopus* U1 RNA which we call embryonic U1 RNAs, xUla and xUlb, are synthesized at the onset of transcription in the 4,000-cell embryo but not in fully grown oocytes. At least four other Ul RNAs are synthesized during late oogenesis and in somatic cells.

As an initial step in the study of the mechanism of the developmental control of X . laevis U1 RNA synthesis, we have analyzed the structure and organization of the genes that are responsible for the synthesis of xUla and xUlb RNAs early in embryogenesis. We report here that these genes are present in ca. 500 tandemly repeated units per haploid genome; the repeat unit contains one copy of each of the embryonic Ul RNA genes. Together, these two types of genes constitute the major Ul gene family, accounting for more than 90% of all U1 RNA genes in X. laevis. The remaining ⁵ to 10% of the genes appear to be dispersed in the genome, analogous to the gene organization in other vertebrates, and may encode oocyte and somatic species of Ul RNAs (32; this study). Thus the Ul RNA genes expressed at various times of development differ both in number and in genomic arrangements. These different gene arrangements might be responsible, at least in part, for the developmental control of Ul RNA synthesis in X. laevis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Analysis of DNA. X. laevis genomic DNA was prepared by standard procedures from liver or erythrocytes (the latter was ^a generous gift of D. D. Brown). DNA fragments were fractionated on 0.7 to 1.2% agarose gels or 6% (60:1) polyacrylamide gels and transferred to nitrocellulose filters as described by Southern (27) or by the bidirectional method of Smith and Summers (26). DNA blots were probed with ³²P-labeled human U1 DNA which was either 3'-end-labeled pU1.15b DNA (kindly provided by A. Weiner) or singlestranded cDNA made of M13mp7 Ul-C DNA (14). Hybridization conditions were $5 \times$ SSC ($1 \times$ SSC is 0.15 M NaCl plus 0.015 M sodium citrate; pH 7.0)-0.1% sodium dodecyl sulfate-1 mM EDTA-20 mM Tris-hydrochloride (pH 7.0)- $5 \times$ Denhardt solution (7)-50% formamide at 37, 42, 50, or 55°C for 20 to 30 h (14).

Cloning of X. laevis U1 RNA genes. The bacteriophage λ Charon 4A library of X . laevis embryo DNA (28) was screened by the method of Benton and Davis (2) with the pU1.15b human Ul DNA probe (see above). All of the five Ul DNA clones $(\lambda X1U1-G-1)$ through -5) obtained by screening a total of 500,000 plaques were found to contain minor X . laevis Ul RNA genes (see Results).

To obtain X. laevis genomic DNA enriched in the major Ul RNA genes, total X . laevis (liver or erythrocyte) DNA was digested with a mixture of BamHI, BglII, KpnI, and XbaI (or BamHI, BgIII, and $EcoRI$) and size fractionated on ⁵ to 20% NaCl gradients (23). Fractions containing large (>25 kilobases [kb]) Ul DNA fragments (identified by

^{*} Corresponding author.

^t Present address: Department of Biology, University of California-San Diego, San Diego, CA 92096.

FIG. 1. Characterization of X. laevis genomic U1 DNA sequences. X . laevis liver DNA was digested with different restriction enzymes and analyzed by Southern blot hybridization. In addition to BamHI and BgIII (lanes 1 to 3 of A), the restriction enzymes $EcoRI$, KpnI, XbaI, XhoI, Sall, and SacII were all found to produce 30 kb of Ul DNA fragments (data not shown). Lanes ¹ to ³ in B show the HindIII digests of genomic DNAs from three additional frogs and lane 10 shows a partial HindIII digest. Genomic DNA (10 μ g) was loaded in each lane, and the digestion products were fractionated in 0.7% agarose gels. After transfer to nitrocellulose filters, hybridization to $32P$ -labeled human U1 DNA (pU1.15b) was at 42C in 50% formamide. Autoradiograms are shown.

Southern blot hybridization) were pooled, and the DNA was redigested with SacI or HindIII to generate unit-length fragments of the U1 repeat DNA. A phage λ library was constructed by the addition of EcoRI linkers to the SacI fragments and insertion of these fragments into the EcoRI site of λ gt10 DNA. Six independent isolates of the major U1 RNA genes $(\lambda X1U1-S-1)$ through -6) were obtained by screening 5,000 plaques from this library. Eleven additional isolates of these genes (pXlU1-H-1 through -11) were obtained by cloning in pBR322. The 1.5-kb HindIII U1 DNA fragments were purified from the HindIII-digested enriched DNA by preparative agarose gel electrophoresis and cloned into pBR322 by transformation of strain HB101. Ampicillinresistant cells were screened by colony hybridization (12), with human Ul cDNA probes (see above).

Expression of X. laevis U1 RNA genes. X . laevis oocyte injections were carried out as previously described (19) except that DNA templates were injected as supercoiled plasmid DNAs ($pX1U1-H$ clones) or as full-length λ DNAs $(XX1U1-S$ and $(X1U1-G$ clones). Total nucleic acids were extracted from the oocytes 20 h after injection and analyzed by polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis either directly or after preparative hybridization to filter-bound human Ul DNA as described elsewhere (19). Total RNAs were analyzed in 8% (30:0.8) polyacrylamide gels containing ⁷ M urea (19), whereas hybrid-selected U1 RNAs were displayed on 15% (19:1) nondenaturing polyacrylamide gels (10a, 13). Purified RNAs were analyzed by RNase T_1 fingerprinting (25) with homomix C (1).

RESULTS

with SacI or by partial digestion with other enzymes such as
HindIII (Fig. 1B, lanes 5 and 10).
The tandem organization of the major U1 RNA gene The major U1 RNA genes in X. laevis DNA are organized in large tandem arrays. When the genomic DNA of X . laevis was assayed by Southern blot analysis, with human Ul RNA genes as probes, a single strongly hybridizing band (Ul DNA) was observed (Fig. 1). The Ul DNA migrated either as undigested (>50 kb) fragments or as a relatively small (<2.0 kb) fragment, depending on which enzymes were used to digest the genomic DNA. This pattern is indicative of a tandemly repeated sequence. In this case, the size of the repeat unit was estimated to be at least 1.9 kb, based on the mobility of the fragments produced by complete digestion HindIII (Fig. 1B, lanes 5 and 10).

The tandem organization of the major Ul RNA gene repeat was established by partial digestion of the genomic DNA with either SacI (Fig. 2) or HindIII (data not shown). In both cases, ^a ladder of bands of Ul DNA was obtained, and the mobilities of the partial digestion products indicated that they were multimers of the 1.9-kb SacI fragment. The results (Fig. 2) demonstrated that the X . laevis genome contained multiple, tandemly repeated 1.9-kb units of Ul DNA. Similar analysis of partial HindIII digests in a 0.4% agarose gel indicated that the tandem array(s) contained at least 20 repeat units (data not shown).

Several of the fragments (Fig. 1B) were smaller than 1.9 kb, presumably as a result of more than one cleavage of the repeat unit. In most cases only one of the resulting fragments was capable of hybridizing the Ul RNA gene probe, but both of the enzymes PstI (lane 9) and PvuII (data not shown) generated two fragments of Ul DNA, the sizes of which added up to 1.9 kb (Fig. 1B). The fact that the two fragments generated by either PstI or PvuII each hybridized approximately half as well as the larger fragments (see also Fig. 3) suggested that the repeat contained two Ul RNA genes which were separated by $PstI$ and $PvuII$ cleavage sites. This conclusion was confirmed by restriction mapping of cloned X. laevis Ul DNA fragments, as described below.

FIG. 2. Tandem organization of the major repeated Ul RNA genes of X . laevis. X . laevis liver DNA was subjected to partial digestion with restriction endonuclease SacI and analyzed by Southern blot hybridization as in Fig. 1. Samples containing 10μ g of DNA were withdrawn after 0, 1, 3, 10, or ³⁰ min of digestion with ² U of Sacl per μ g of genomic DNA (lanes 1 to 5). The single major band in lane ⁵ corresponds to 1.9-kb-long Ul DNA fragments, and the ladder of bands observed in lanes 2 to 4 corresponds to integral multimers of the basic 1.9-kb repeat DNA, as indicated.

In addition to the major intense band of hybridization, each digest of genomic DNA contained several minor bands which were detectable only upon longer exposures of the autoradiograms. Since each restriction enzyme produced a distinct pattern of minor bands (Fig. ¹ and 3B), it appeared that the corresponding Ul DNA sequences were dispersed in the genome rather than being tandemly arranged. A few of these bands might represent Ul DNA fragments derived from the junctions between the ends of the tandem arrays and the adjacent sequences. However, other minor bands were found to correspond to Ul RNA genes which differed from the major Ul repeat DNA (see below). Few, if any, of these minor bands represented Ul RNA pseudogenes, since the patterns of bands were not influenced by the stringency of hybridization, i.e., no differences were observed between patterns generated by hybridization at 37 or 55°C (data not shown).

The same patterns and size classes of fragments were produced by analysis of genomic DNAs isolated from the liver (Fig. 1) or erythrocytes (Fig. 3). Furthermore, no differences were observed between either the major or minor bands of Ul DNA in genomic DNAs obtained from individual frogs (cf. lanes 1, 2, and 3 of Fig. 1B).

FIG. 3. Determination of gene copy numbers of the major and minor U1 RNA genes of X. laevis. Samples (4 μ g) of X. laevis erythrocyte were digested with PstI (lanes 1) or HindlIl (lanes 2) and fractionated in a 1.2% agarose gel. Copy number standards for the major Ul DNA repeat were provided by adjacent lanes (3 to 6) containing different amounts of HindlIl-digested pXlU1-H1 DNA (cf. Fig. 4C and 5). Autoradiograms of the nitrocellulose filter exposed for 20 (A) or 100 (B) h are shown. The dots in lanes ¹ and ² of B indicate the position of minor Ul hybrid bands. Assuming that the haploid genome of X. laevis contains 3×10^9 base pairs (6), the amounts of pXlU1-H1 DNA loaded corresponded to 20, 100, 1,000, and 2,000 copies of Ul RNA coding region sequences per haploid genome (lanes 3 to 6). Lanes 3 to 6 also contained 4 μ g of HincIl-digested human fibroblast DNA as ^a carrier and as an internal control for low copy numbers of Ul RNA genes. The human DNA fragments indicated corresponded to ⁵ to ¹⁵ copies of Ul RNA genes per haploid genome (14). The nitrocellulose filter was probed with ³²P-labeled human U1 DNA (HU1-1C) in 50% formamide at 50°C.

The X. laevis genome contains ca. 500 copies of each of the major Ul RNA genes. The copy number of the major Ul DNA repeat was determined by ^a reconstruction experiment in which various amounts of a cloned copy of the repeat (see below) were digested with HindIII and electrophoresed adjacent to HindIII-digested X. laevis genomic DNA. The results (Fig. 3) demonstrate that the intensity of the major hybrid band in the genomic DNA corresponds to ca. ⁵⁰⁰ copies of the repeat DNA per haploid genome equivalent or to 1,000 copies of Ul RNA coding region sequences (see the legend to Fig. 3).

The copy numbers of the minor dispersed U1 DNA sequences were determined in the same experiment after a longer exposure of the autoradiogram. It appears that each of the minor X . laevis bands corresponds to between 5 and 20 copies per haploid genome of Ul DNA sequences (Fig. 3B). A comparison of the minor hybrid bands with bands of known copy numbers in human genomic DNA (lane 4) supports these estimates. Therefore, we conclude that there is a total of ca. 40 to 50 copies per haploid genome of Ul DNA sequences that are not located in the highly repeated tandem array.

Cloning of the major and the minor Ul RNA genes. Initially, we attempted to isolate the major 1.9-kb repeat DNA from a genomic bank of X. laevis embryo DNA cloned in bacteriophage λ (28), but from ca. 500,000 plaques screened, no representatives of the highly repeated Ul DNA were isolated. We did, however, obtain five clones $(\lambda X1U1 -$ G) which upon digestion with HindlIl produced a 5-kb Ul DNA fragment (Fig. 4A), presumably corresponding to one of the minor fragments observed in HindlIl-digested genomic DNA (cf. Fig. 3). Zeller et al. (32), who reported the isolation of a clone very similar (or identical) to these clones, also were unable to obtain clones of the major Ul repeat from this genomic library. Analysis of total DNA isolated from this particular genomic library indicated that it was deficient in recombinant phages carrying the major Ul RNA gene repeat (data not shown).

To clone the major DNA repeat, we prepared X . laevis DNA enriched in these sequences by size fractionation of total genomic DNA which had been digested with enzymes that do not cleave the tandem array. Unit-length Ul repeat DNA was then released from the large (>50 kb) DNA fragments by cleavage with Sacl or HindIII and was cloned into λ or pBR322 DNA, respectively.

The cloned SacI fragments of X. laevis U1 DNA were identical in size to that of the 1.9-kb repeat units of genomic DNA (Fig. 4B). In each λ phage DNA preparation, however, ^a various amount of DNA was observed that contained a smaller insert; apparently, this smaller insert resulted from the loss (by homologous recombination) of 0.6 kb of DNA between two Ul RNA coding regions (data not shown).

Cloning of the 1.5-kb HindIll fragments of the Ul repeat DNA in plasmid pBR322 resulted in the isolation of stable recombinant plasmids that showed no evidence of accumulating deletions upon propagation. Figure 4C shows four representative isolates of these clones. Although multiple independent isolates of these sequences appeared homogenous in size (Fig. 4C), fine structure analyses revealed several regions of minor sequence heterogeneity (Fig. 4D). As indicated on the physical map of the Ul repeat unit DNA, these heterogeneities corresponded to small deletions (15 to 25 base pairs) located both outside and within the coding region of one of the Ul RNA genes (thin vertical arrows in Fig. 5).

FIG. 4. Characterization of cloned copies of the major and minor U1 RNA genes of X. laevis. Three types of clones carrying X. laevis U1 DNA fragments were characterized by restriction enzyme analyses: (A) recombinant phages (XX1U1-G) from the genomic library of Wahli and Dawid (28); (B) λ recombinant phages (λ X1U1-S) from a bank enriched in the full-length 1.9kb-long U1 DNA repeat; and (C and D) pBR322 recombinant plasmids (pXlU1-H) carrying 1.5 kb of the major Ul DNA repeat. (A) Analysis of HindIIl digests of AXlUl-G DNAs obtained from plaque-purified isolates of three independent clones (lanes ¹ to 4). Southern blot hybridization was performed as in Fig. 1; an autoradiogram is shown. The different sizes of the Ul DNA fragments in independent isolates of one clone (lanes ³ and 4) indicate that DNA sequences within this fragment were lost upon phage propagation. (B) Analysis of EcoRI digests of λ X1U1-S DNAs obtained.from four independent clones (lanes 1 to 4). A SacI digest of genomic Xenopus liver DNA (lane 5) and a limit $EcoRI$ -partial PstI digest of λ DNA from the recombinant phage of lane ¹ (lane 6) are shown. The Ul DNA fragments were detected as in Fig. 1A; an autoradiogram is shown. The presence of smaller U1 DNA inserts in all phage DNA preparations suggests that sequences within the U1 repeat DNA are frequently lost. (C and D) Analyses of four independent isolates of pXlU1-H clones. Ethidium-bromide stained gels (left) and corresponding autoradiograms (right) of the Ul DNA fragments are presented. Southern blot hybridizations were performed as in Fig. ³ with the human Ul RNA coding region probe. (C) HindIII digests of DNAs from clones 1, 8, 6, and 7 are shown. HindIII-digested X. laevis erythrocyte DNA (genomic), HindIII plus EcoRI-digested λ DNA (λ), and HindIII-digested pBR322 DNA (pBR322) were included as size markers in the 1% agarose gel. (D) DdeI digests of the same four DNAs, analyzed in a 6% polyacrylamide gel. The size markers were pBR322 DNA digested with HaeIII (HaeIII) or DdeI (pBR322). The observed sequence heterogeneities define three classes of 1.5-kb HindIII U1 repeat DNA fragments (clones ¹ and ⁷ belong to the same class). The presence (and the sizes) of the four DdeI U1 DNA fragments indicates that the U1 repeat DNA contains two Ul RNA genes.

Southern blot analysis, with a variety of restriction enzymes, confirmed that each repeat unit contained two different Ul RNA gene coding regions (Fig. 4D and data not shown). The orientations of the two U1 RNA coding regions were determined by the relative positions of restriction enzyme cleavage sites known to be located within the coding regions of Ul RNA genes from RNA sequence data (3, lOa, 14).

The Ul RNA genes within the repeat DNA were tentatively identified as coding for xUla and xUlb embryonic RNAs (10a) on the basis of their restriction cleavage sites. Specifically, both U1 RNA coding regions contained a DdeI cleavage site (CTCAG) at the position corresponding to nucleotides 59 to 63 in the RNAs, and sequences corresponding to this site were found to be hallmarks of the two embryonic Ul RNAs (cf. Fig. ³ and Table ¹ of reference 10a). Furthermore, the Sall cleavage site (GTCGAC, corresponding to positions ¹¹⁵ to 120 of xUlb RNA) unique to one of the coding regions (gene B, Fig. 5) was indicative of a gene for xUlb RNA.

The embryonic Ul RNAs, xUla and xUlb, are encoded by the Ul RNA genes of the major repeat unit. The suggestion that both embryonic Ul RNA species were encoded by the major Ul repeat DNA was tested directly by injection of the cloned DNA into the nuclei of mature X . laevis oocytes. In this experiment, the cloned DNAs from seven independent isolates of the 1.5-kb HindIll fragment were coinjected with $[\alpha^{-32}P]GTP$; 20 h later, total RNA was isolated and analyzed by polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis (Fig. 6). Clearly, injection of each of the cloned DNAs of the X . laevis U1

FIG. 5. Physical map of the major U1 DNA repeat of X. laevis. The restriction enzyme cleavage map was obtained by analyses of cloned copies of the repeat DNA by standard procedures (cf. Fig. 4B to D). The positions and orientations of the two Ul RNA coding regions are indicated by heavy arrows. Thin vertical arrows denote regions of sequence heterogeneities. The general structures of the XlU1-DNA clones discussed in the text are shown above and below the map. D, DdeI; H2, HinclI; H3, HindIII; P, PstI; Pv, PvuII; S, SacI; Sa, SalI; (D), polymorphic DdeI cleavage site (cf. pX1U1-H-6 of FIg. 4D); bp, base pairs.

repeat resulted in the synthesis of large amounts of Ul RNA, comparable to the amount obtained by injection of a clone of ^a human Ul RNA gene (compare pHUl-iD with pXlU1-H [lanes 1 to 7] in Fig. 6A). The \overline{X} . laevis U1 RNAs were further characterized by analysis of the hybrid-selected U1 RNAs in a nondenaturing 15% polyacrylamide gel. (The use of this gel system for the separation of different species of X. laevis U1 RNAs is discussed in detail elsewhere [10a].) From electrophoretic mobilities of the Ul RNAs in this gel (Fig. 6B) and from the RNase T_1 fingerprints of the individual gel-purified RNAs (Fig. 6C), we concluded that the two species of Ul RNAs encoded by the repeat unit did, in fact, correspond to the embryonic Ul RNAs, xUla and xUlb, which we had recently identified (10a). The λ X1U1-S clone, containing the 1.9-kb Sacl fragment, was also transcriptionally active and was found to encode embryonic Ul RNAs (data not shown). As predicted, injection of the DNA of ^a subclone of the major U1 repeat containing only the A gene coding region (pX1U1A; cf. Fig. 5) resulted in the synthesis of only xUla RNA (Fig. 6B).

Oocyte and somatic Ul RNAs are encoded by less abundant Ul RNA genes. Injection of the cloned DNA containing the

FIG. 6. Expression of the embryonic U1 RNAs encoded by the major U1 DNA repeat in X. laevis oocytes. Cloned copies of the 1.5-kb HindIII fragments (pX1U1-H DNAs, cf. Fig. 5) were coinjected with $\alpha^{-32}PJGTP$ into the nuclei of X. laevis stage V to VI oocytes. Total nucleic acids were prepared after ²⁰ ^h of incubation and analyzed by electrophoresis in an 8% (30:0.8) polyacrylamide gel containing ⁷ M urea (A). Each lane contains total RNA of two oocytes; the injected DNAs were pXlU1-H-1 through -7 and pHU1-lD, ^a cloned human Ul RNA gene (19). (B) Hybrid-selected Ul RNAs from ¹ to ² oocytes injected with pXlU1-H-2 (lane 1) or pX1U1A-2 (lane 2) or from ²⁰ oocytes which received no DNA (lane 3) were fractionated in ^a 15% nondenaturing polyacrylamide gel. (C) The individual Ul RNAs of lanes ¹ and ² were eluted and analyzed by RNase T fingerprinting, revealing that the two Ul RNAs encoded by the major Ul repeat DNA were the embryonic species, xUla and xUlb, as indicated. The lower case letters (a to e) and numbers (12 and 13) refer to RNase T oligonucleotides which were found to be characteristic of the two embryonic Ul RNAs as shown in Fig. ² and in Table ¹ of reference 10a.

minor 5-kb HindIII Ul DNA fragment (i.e., DNA from XX1U1-G, cf. Fig. 4A) also led to the synthesis of Ul RNA. This U1 RNA was shown by RNase T_1 fingerprint analysis to be one of the minor U1 RNA species synthesized in X . laevis tissue culture cells and stage VI oocytes rather than either of the embryonic species xUla and xUlb (data not shown). This finding is in agreement with the sequences of two minor Ul RNA genes from ^a similar clone as determined by Zeller et al. (32).

DISCUSSION

We have demonstrated that X . *laevis* contains ca. 1,000 copies of the genes for Ul RNA per haploid genome and that two different embryonic Ul RNA genes make up more than 90% of the Ul DNA sequences. These embryonic Ul RNA genes are organized in one or more large arrays, with a total of ca. 500 tandemly repeated units. Each 1.9-kb repeat unit encodes both of the two Ul RNAs that are synthesized during early embryogenesis (10a).

The major and minor gene families encode different species of Ul RNAs. In addition to the major family of highly repeated U1 RNA genes, the X . laevis genome also contains several minor families of dispersed Ul RNA genes that are present in less than 50 copies per haploid genome. Similar results have been obtained independently by Zeller et al. (32), who recently reported the isolation of one of the minor 5-kb HindIlI fragments of X. Iaevis Ul DNA. That clone, which contains three genes for different species of Ul RNAs, might well correspond to the XXlU1-G clones described here (cf. Fig. 4A). Thus it appears that at least one of the minor families of Ul RNA genes encodes somatic Ul RNAs. We infer that the dispersed genes must be responsible for the synthesis of all of the Ul RNAs specific to late oocytes and somatic cells since the repetitive Ul RNA genes encode the embryonic Ul RNAs. A possibility, which cannot be ruled out at the present time however, is that a small fraction (<10%) of the major U1 DNA repeat encodes oocyte or somatic Ul RNA species. This latter possibility seems highly unlikely in view of the sequence homogeneity of the cloned repeats. In particular, we note that the Ul RNAs encoded by seven different clones of the repeat appeared identical by RNase T_1 fingerprinting (data not shown) and that restriction enzyme cleavage sites were highly conserved between independent isolates of the repeating unit.

X. laevis Ul and U2 RNA genes show striking homology in organization. Recently, Mattaj and Zeller (17) described the organization of the U2 RNA genes in X . laevis. Again, the major U2 RNA genes were found to be tandemly repeated (in this case with ^a single copy of the U2 DNA per 0.85-kb repeating unit), and minor U2 RNA genes appeared to be dispersed rather than tandemly arranged. Because of the similar organization of the Ul and U2 RNA genes, it is appealing to speculate that the expression of the highly repeated genes is coordinately controlled during development. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for this idea since little information is available about the synthesis of U2 RNA in X. laevis. However, RNase T_1 fingerprint analysis of U2 RNA synthesized during early embryogenesis supports the hypothesis that the embryonic U2 RNA is encoded by the abundant reiterated U2 RNA genes (E. Lund and D. Forbes, unpublished data).

Differential control of expression of RNA genes in X . laevis. For several years the oocyte and somatic 5S RNA genes of Xenopus spp. have provided a model system for studying developmental control of the expression of two classes of reiterated RNA genes (4, 11, 22). The presence of 20,000 tandemly arranged oocyte-specific 5S RNA genes allows for the high rate of 5S RNA synthesis that is required during oogenesis.

It is possible that a high copy number of the embryonic Ul RNA genes is required in ^a similar way for the very efficient Ul RNA synthesis at the onset of transcription in the 4,000-cell blastula embryo. At this stage of embryogenesis, the midblastula transition (20), the cells are still dividing rapidly (approximately once per hour), and the stockpile of previously synthesized Ul RNAs has been depleted (10). Therefore, ^a high rate of Ul RNA transcription might be required at this time; that may be accomplished most efficiently by activation of the tandemly reiterated Ul RNA genes. Whether the mechanism of differential control of Ul RNA expression is similar to that regulating the 5S gene system (29, 31) remains to be determined.

Transcription of embryonic genes in X . laevis oocytes. Although transcription of the highly reiterated Ul RNA genes is not normally observed during late oogenesis, efficient transcription of these genes does occur upon injection of cloned copies of the repeat DNA into stage V and VI oocytes. The relative levels of xUla and xUlb synthesis in oocytes injected with pXU1-H DNAs, however, are not identical to those in embryos. More specifically, xUla RNA is the minor product in such injected oocytes (cf. Fig. 6B), whereas it is the major U1 RNA species in the embryo; the reverse is true for xUlb RNA (cf. Fig. ² of reference lOa). One explanation for this quantitative discrepancy is that the injected clones of the 1.5-kb HindIII fragment lack some of the 5 flanking region sequences normally located far upstream of the xUla genes (see the map of Fig. 5); the absence of such far-upstream sequences could affect the level of transcription of the xUla RNA. A more interesting possibility, however, is that the difference in xUla and xUlb RNA accumulation might accurately reflect the control of expression of the two embryonic genes in the oocyte. In that case, the low rate of transcription of the xUla gene (which is very actively transcribed in the embryo) might demonstrate some of the cell specificity observed during development. Additional experiments utilizing our clone of the full-length Ul repeat DNA should allow us to distinguish between these possibilities.

Although it is unknown how the major class of Ul RNA genes is maintained in a quiescent state until the onset of embryonic transcription, it is possible that the clustering of the embryonic Ul RNA genes could facilitate the simultaneous activation of many repeating transcription units. It will be of interest to determine how differences in flanking region sequences affect the differential expression of the various Ul RNA genes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank J. Mitchen for technical assistance, D. Stalsberg for typing the manuscript, and E. Schenborn, J. Skuzeski, and J. Newport for critical comments. D. F. thanks M. Kirschner and T. Kornberg for generous support and encouragement.

This work was supported by Public Health Service grant GM30220 from the National Institutes of Health and by grant PCM 83-09618 from the National Science Foundation to J. E. D. and E. L. and by an American Cancer Society Senior Postdoctoral Fellowship-California Division (S-14-82) to D.F.

LITERATURE CITED

1. Barrell, B. G. 1971. Fractionation and sequence analysis of radioactive nucleotides, p. 751-779. In G. L. Cantoni and D. R.

- 2. Benton, W. D., and R. W. Davis. 1977. Screening Agt recombinant clones by in situ hybridization to single plaques in situ. Science 196:180-182.
- 3. Branlant, C., A. Krol, J. -P. Ebel, E. Lazar, B. Gallinaro, M. Jacob, J. Sri-Widada, and P. Jeanteur. 1980. Nucleotide sequences of nuclear UlA RNAs from chicken, rat and man. Nucleic Acids Res. 8:4143-4154.
- 4. Brownlee, G. G., E. M. Cartwright, and D. D. Brown. 1974. Sequence studies of the 5S DNA of Xenopus laevis. J. Mol. Biol. 89:703-718.
- 5. Card, C. O., G. F. Morris, D. T. Brown, and W. F. Marzluff. 1982. Sea urchin small nuclear RNA genes are organized in distinct tandemly repeating units. Nucleic Acids Res. 10: 7677-7688.
- 6. Dawid, I. B. 1965. Deoxyribonucleic acid in amphibian eggs. J. Mol. Biol. 12:581-599.
- 7. Denhardt, D. T. 1966. A membrane-filter technique for the detection of complementary DNA. Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun. 23:641-646.
- 8. Denison, R. A., S. W. Van Arsdell, L. B. Bernstein, and A. M. Weiner. 1981. Abundant pseudogenes for small nuclear RNAs are dispersed in the human genome. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 78:810-814.
- 9. Denison, R. A., and A. M. Weiner. 1982. Human U1 RNA pseudogenes may be generated by both DNA- and RNA-mediated mechanisms. Mol. Cell. Biol. 2:815-828.
- 10. Forbes, D. F., T. B. Kornberg, and M. W. Kirschner. 1983. Small nuclear RNA transcription and ribonucleoprotein assembly in early Xenopus development. J. Cell Biol. 97:62-72.
- 10a.Forbes, D. J., M. W. Kirschner, D. Caput, J. E. Dahlberg, and E. Lund. 1984. Differential expression of multiple Ul small nuclear RNAs in oocytes and embryos of Xenopus laevis. Cell 38:681-689.
- 11. Ford, J. P., and E. M. Southern. 1973. Different sequences for 5S RNA in kidney cells and ovaries of Xenopus laevis. Nat. New Biol. 241:7-12.
- 12. Grunstein, M., and D. S. Hogness. 1975. Colony hybridization: a method for the isolation of cloned DNAs that contain ^a specific gene. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 72:3961-3965.
- 13. Lund, E., C. Bostock, M. Robertson, S. Christie, J. L. Mitchen, and J. E. Dahlberg. 1983. Ul small nuclear RNA genes are located on human chromosome ¹ and are expressed in mousehuman hybrid cells. Mol. Cell. Biol. 3:2211-2220.
- 14. Lund, E., and J. E. Dahlberg. 1984. True genes for human Ul small nuclear RNA: copy number, polymorphism and methylation. J. Biol. Chem. 259:2013-2021.
- 15. Manser, T., and R. F. Gesteland. 1982. Human Ul loci: genes for human Ul RNA have dramatically similar genomic environments. Cell 29:257-264.
- 16. Marzluff, W. F., D. T. Brown, S. Lobo, and S. S. Wang. 1983. Isolation and characterization of two linked mouse Ulb small nuclear RNA genes. Nucleic Acids Res. 11:6255-6270.
- 17. Mattaj, I. W., and R. Zeller. 1983. Xenopus laevis U2 snRNA genes: tandemly repeated transcription units sharing ⁵' and ³' flanking homology with other RNA polymerase II transcribed genes. EMBO J. 2:1883-1891.
- 18. Monstein, H.-F., K. Hammerstr \uparrow øm, G. Westin, J. Zabielski, L. Philipson, and U. Petterson. 1983. Loci for human U1 RNAstructural and evolutionary implications. J. Mol. Biol. 167: 245-257.
- 19. Murphy, J. T., R. R. Burgess, J. E. Dahlberg, and E. Lund. 1982. Transcription of a gene for human U1 small nuclear RNA. Cell 29:265-274.
- 20. Newport, J. W., and M. W. Kirschner. 1982. A major developmental transition in early Xenopus embryos. I. Characterization and timing of cellular changes at the midblastula stage. Cell. 30:675-686.
- 21. Nojima, H., and R. Kornberg. 1983. Genes and pseudogenes for mouse Ul and U2 small nuclear RNAs. J. Biol. Chem. 258:8151-8155.
- 22. Peterson, R. C., J. L. Doering, and D. D. Brown. 1980. Characterization of two Xenopus somatic 5S DNAs and one minor oocyte-specific SS DNA. Cell 20:131-141.
- 23. Rice, P. W., and J. E. Dahlberg. 1982. A gene between polA and gluA retards growth of Escherichia coli when present in multiple copies: physiological effects of the gene for spot 42 RNA. J. Bacteriol. 152:1196-1210.
- 24. Roop, D. R., P. Kristo, W. E. Stumph, M. J. Tsai, and B. W. O'Malley. 1981. Structure and expression of a chicken gene coding for Ul RNA. Cell 23:671-680.
- 25. Sanger, F., G. G. Brownlee, and B. G. Burrell. 1965. Two-dimensional fractionation procedure for radioactive nucleotides. J. Mol. Biol. 13:373-398.
- 26. Smith, G. E., and M. D. Summers. 1980. The bidirectional transfer of DNA and RNA to nitrocellulose or diazobenzyloxymethyl-paper. Anal. Biochem. 109:123-129.
- 27. Southern, E. M. 1976. Detection of specific sequences among DNA fragments separated by gel electrophoresis. J. Mol. Biol. 98:503-517.
- 28. Wahli, W., and I. B. Dawid. 1980. Isolation of two closely related vitellogenin genes, including their flanking regions, from a Xenopus laevis gene library. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. 77:1437-1441.
- 29. Wakefield, L., and J. B. Gurdon. 1983. Cytoplasmic regulation of 5S RNA genes in nuclear-transplant embryos. EMBO J. 2:1613-1619.
- 30. Watanabe-Nagasu, N., Y. Itoh, T. Tani, K. Okano, N. Koga, N. Okada, and Y. Ohshima. 1982. Structural analysis of gene loci for rat U1 small nuclear RNA. Nucleic Acids Res. 11:1791-1801.
- 31. Wormington, W. M., M. Schlissel, and D. D. Brown. 1983. Developmental regulation of Xenopus SS RNA genes. Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quant. Biol. 47:879-884.
- 32. Zeller, R., M.-T. Carri, I. W. Mattaj, and E. M. DeRobertis. 1984. Xenopus laevis Ul snRNA genes: characterization of transcriptionally active genes reveals major and minor repeated gene families. EMBO J. 3:1075-1081.