Molecular Dissection of the AGAMOUS Control Region Shows That cis Elements for Spatial Regulation Are Located Intragenically
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AGAMOUS (AG) is an Arabidopsis MADS box gene required for the normal development of the internal two whorls of the flower. AG RNA accumulates in distinct patterns early and late in flower development, and several genes have been identified as regulators of AG gene expression based on altered AG RNA accumulation in mutants. To understand AG regulatory circuits, we are now identifying cis regulatory domains by characterizing AG::GUS gene fusions. These studies show that a normal AG::GUS staining pattern is conferred by a 9.8-kb region encompassing 6 kb of upstream sequences and 3.8 kb of intragenic sequences. Constructs lacking the 3.8-kb intragenic sequences confer a GUS staining pattern that deviates both spatially and temporally from normal AG expression. The GUS staining patterns in the mutants for the three negative regulators of AG, apetala2, leunig, and curly leaf, showed the predicted change of expression for the construct containing the intragenic sequences, but no significant change was observed for the constructs lacking this intragenic region. These results suggest that intragenic sequences are essential for AG regulation and that these intragenic sequences contain the ultimate target sites for at least some of the known regulatory molecules.

INTRODUCTION

Genetic dissection of pattern formation in many organisms has revealed complex circuitry for regulatory gene expression. For example, in flower development, the pattern of floral organs is achieved through region-specific patterns of homeotic gene activity (reviewed in Weigel and Meyerowitz, 1994). This regional activity of the homeotic genes requires initial activation by meristem identity genes and delimitation of the zone of activity through the functions of cadastral genes. One approach toward understanding pattern formation is to characterize how a gene's regulatory elements confer its temporal and spatial patterns of expression. To achieve a clearer understanding of the regulatory circuits controlling flower development, we are now identifying the DNA elements that are required to specify the normal pattern of AGAMOUS (AG) expression.

AG is an Arabidopsis MADS box gene that is required in the third and fourth whorls of developing flowers to specify the identity of the organs that arise in these two whorls (stamens and carpels, respectively) and to confer determinacy to the floral meristem (Bowman et al., 1989; Yanofsky et al., 1990). By using in situ hybridization, AG RNA was shown to be expressed early in flower development in the region of the floral meristem that gives rise to the third- and fourth-whorl organs (Drews et al., 1991). This early expression pattern is consistent with the proposed role of AG in specification of these two organs. A distinct pattern of late AG expression was revealed by examination of AG RNA accumulation in mature flowers (Bowman et al., 1991). In mature stamens, AG RNA is concentrated in the connective tissue; in carpels, AG RNA accumulates in the stigma and ovules. Young ovules show an essentially uniform AG expression pattern, which, as the ovules develop, becomes resolved into a single cell layer of AG expression in the endothelium.

In addition to the complex AG expression pattern observed in wild-type flowers, several different genes have been identified as regulators of AG based on altered AG RNA abundance patterns in mutant plants. For instance, both APETALA2 (AP2) and LEUNIG (LUG) are negative regulators of early floral expression of AG in the outer whorls; plants carrying mutations of these genes show AG RNA accumulation in the outer whorls of the flower (Drews et al., 1991; Liu and Meyerowitz, 1995). Similarly, CURLY LEAF (CLF) is a negative regulator of vegetative AG expression, and in clf mutants, AG RNA accumulates in leaves (Coupland et al., 1993). The meristem identity genes LEAFY (LFY) and APETALA1 (AP1) are involved in accurate activation of AG
expression and have overlapping roles as positive regulators of AG (Weigel and Meyerowitz, 1993).

The combination of a complex pattern of developmental regulation of expression and many genes identified as regulators of its expression makes AG a candidate for studies of regulatory control elements. We have examined the ability of two overlapping regions of the AG gene to confer an AG pattern of expression on the β-glucuronidase (GUS) reporter gene. We present an analysis of the GUS staining patterns conferred by these two constructs in the wild type and in ap2, lug, and clf mutants. Results of this analysis suggest that important control regions are located within a transcribed region of the gene that is primarily intronic and that additional regulators of late AG expression patterns in the ovule remain to be identified.

RESULTS

AG Reporter Gene Fusions

The AG gene contains at least nine exons and eight introns (Figure 1A; Yanofsky et al., 1990). That the sequences required for normal AG expression might not be simply within the 5’ upstream region was suggested by the lack of a phenotype for transgenic plants carrying AG upstream sequences fused to the AP3 coding region (L.E. Sieburth, T. Jack, and E.M. Meyerowitz, unpublished results). The large size of intron 2 (~3 kb) made it a good candidate for the location of regulatory sequences. To test whether this region of the AG gene contains the sequences required to confer its normal pattern of gene expression, we assembled two gene fusions between the AG genomic region and the GUS reporter gene. The first construct, pAG-I::GUS (Figure 1B), contains ~6 kb of upstream sequences plus 3.8 kb of genomic sequences. The genomic region extends into exon 3 and is fused to GUS near the 5’ end of this exon at nucleotide 331 of the cDNA (Yanofsky et al., 1990). This fusion site was selected to preserve the intron-exon splice junction while retaining a minimum of coding sequences from exon 3. The second construct, pAG::GUS, is shown in Figure 1C. It contains the same 6 kb of upstream sequences as in the first construct. Because the translational start site has not been identified for AG (Yanofsky et al., 1990), we fused the GUS coding region close to the 3’ end of the first described exon (at nucleotide 91 of the cDNA). We used this fusion site to ensure the use of the usual transcriptional and translation start sites for AG, and differences in expression (GUS staining) patterns between the two constructs should have been due only to the presence and/or absence of intron 1, intron 2, and exon 2.

Each construct was introduced into Arabidopsis ecotype Nossen (No-O). For each construct, GUS staining patterns were examined in at least 10 lines of independent transformants. Although variation in the intensity of staining was observed among lines carrying a given construct, the patterns of GUS staining were indistinguishable. Subsequent detailed analyses used the transgenic line pGUS1.4a for the pAG::GUS construct and 635c2 for the pAG-I::GUS construct. Occasionally, some individuals from two of the transgenic lines carrying the pAG-I::GUS construct displayed a strong ag mutant phenotype. We were unable to detect GUS staining in these plants, suggesting that the mutant phenotype is the result of a cosuppression phenomenon (reviewed in Dougherty and Parks, 1995) rather than of an activity of the pAG-I::GUS gene fusion product.

GUS Staining Patterns in Intact Tissue

Seedlings stained for GUS activity are shown in Figure 2A. The seedling on the right contains the pAG-I::GUS construct and shows no GUS staining. Because AG RNA has not been detected in the vegetative tissues of wild-type plants, this lack of GUS activity is consistent with the pAG-I::GUS construct conferring a normal AG expression pattern. A GUS-stained seedling carrying the pAG::GUS construct is shown at the left in Figure 2A. GUS staining, readily apparent in the leaf blades and in the stem, suggests that this construct lacks at least some AG regulatory control elements.

GUS-stained inflorescences of plants carrying the pAG::GUS and the pAG-I::GUS constructs are shown in Figures 2B and 2C, respectively. GUS staining was not detectable in the young floral buds of plants carrying the pAG::GUS construct (Figure 2B), and in the older flowers,
Figure 2. GUS Staining Patterns of Whole Tissue of Transgenic Arabidopsis (No-0) Plants.

(A) Fourteen-day-old GUS-stained seedlings. The seedling at left carries the pAG::GUS transgene, and the seedling at right carries the pAG-l::GUS transgene.

(B) Inflorescence from a plant carrying the pAG::GUS transgene.

(C) Inflorescence from a plant carrying the pAG-l::GUS transgene.

(D) Flower from a plant carrying the pAG::GUS transgene.

(E) Flower from a plant carrying the pAG-l::GUS transgene.

the staining product was most prominent in the sepals. In contrast, inflorescences from plants with the pAG-l::GUS construct showed intense GUS staining in very young buds (Figure 2C). In situ hybridization of AG RNA shows the most intense signal in very young floral buds, starting with stage 3 flowers (Drews et al., 1991). Thus, the staining pattern for the pAG-l::GUS construct matches our expectations of an AG expression pattern. A stained flower at anthesis (stage 13; for stage 13 and all subsequent floral stages, refer to Smyth et al., 1990) from a pAG::GUS plant is shown in Figure 2D, and a flower from a pAG-l::GUS plant is shown in Figure 2E. The flower carrying the pAG::GUS construct showed intense staining in the sepals, the anthers, and the stigma, whereas the flower from a plant that contained the pAG-l::GUS construct lacked staining in the sepals but displayed a small amount of staining in a few regions of the stamens and carpels. Because in the wild type, AG RNA is restricted to the third and fourth whorl of the flower, only the pAG-l::GUS construct appears to confer a GUS staining pattern that reflects normal AG RNA distributions. The differences between these staining patterns suggest that spatial, temporal, and quantitative aspects of AG gene expression require intragenic sequences.

Detailed Analysis of GUS Staining in Plants Carrying pAG::GUS and pAG-l::GUS

Examination of GUS staining in intact tissue provides only a generalized idea of the reporter gene expression pattern. To define these patterns in cellular detail, inflorescences that were histochemically stained for GUS activity were embedded in paraplast and sectioned. Figure 3 shows GUS staining patterns observed for plants containing the pAG-l::GUS construct. Under dark-field illumination, the particulate staining product appears as reddish dots on the greenish white background of unstained tissue. An inflorescence meristem, along with stage 2, early stage 3, and stage 5 flowers, is shown in Figure 3A. No staining was seen in the inflorescence meristem or the stage 2 flower. The early stage 3 flower shows a small amount of staining in the central part of the floral meristem, and the stage 5 flower shows intense staining throughout the central part of the flower. In Figure 3B, the stage 3 and stage 4 flowers also show GUS staining that is restricted to the region that will give rise to the third- and fourth-whorl organs. Figure 3B also includes two flowers at stage 7; the one to the right shows a small petal primordium that is not stained, and both show heavy staining in the developing stamens and carpels. GUS staining patterns in all of these flowers were indistinguishable from the pattern of AG RNA accumulation in wild-type flowers, as has been documented by in situ hybridization (Drews et al., 1991).

GUS staining patterns in mature flowers carrying the pAG-l::GUS transgene were also studied. Figure 3C shows the apex of a carpel in which abundant staining is clearly visible in the stigma along with a small amount of stain in the style.
Figure 3. GUS Staining Patterns from Plants Carrying the pAG-l::GUS Transgene.

(A) Sections through an inflorescence meristem with stage 2, stage 3, and stage 5 flowers. GUS staining is visible only in the stage 3 and stage 5 flowers and is localized to the central region of the floral meristem.

(B) Section through an inflorescence containing stage 3, stage 4, and two stage 7 flowers. The two stage 7 flowers show abundant GUS staining that is restricted to the developing stamens and carpels and that is absent from the sepals and petal primordia.

(C) A longitudinal section of the apex of a carpel showing abundant GUS staining in the stigmatic papillae and a lower level of staining in the style.

(D) Cross-section of a stamen showing GUS staining in the connective tissue and in the tapetum but not in the developing pollen grains or in the sepal or petal.

(E) Longitudinal section of a carpel from a stage 12 flower showing essentially uniform GUS staining in the developing ovules.

(F) An ovule from a stage 14 flower showing GUS staining that is restricted to the endothelium.

Bars = 100 μm.

A cross-section of a stamen is shown in Figure 3D. Abundant staining can be observed in the tapetum and the connective tissue. Sections of carpels in Figures 3E and 3F show the GUS staining pattern observed in ovules of stage 12 and 14 flowers, respectively. Ovules of stage 12 flowers show uniform GUS staining; accumulation of the GUS staining product in the mature ovule is much more restricted, being abundant mainly in the endothelial cell layer. The ability to detect this very late pattern of GUS staining was somewhat variable. We attribute the variability to the long half-life of the GUS enzyme (Jefferson et al., 1987). This long half-life is expected to result in a lag between a decrease in RNA abundance and the corresponding decrease in GUS staining.

The patterns of GUS staining in pAG-l::GUS plants generally mirror those that have been documented for AG RNA accumulation in wild-type flowers (Bowman et al., 1991; Drews et al., 1991). One possible exception is that abundant GUS staining was observed in the tapetum of mature stamens. The question of whether AG is expressed in the tapetum has not been addressed previously. Our result suggests that AG is expressed in this tissue; alternatively, additional sequences (3’ or intragenic in the 3’ half of the gene) may be needed to repress expression within the tapetum. All of the other GUS staining results indicate that the AG DNA sequences included in the pAG-l::GUS plants are sufficient to confer the expected AG pattern of gene expression both early and late in development.

The staining pattern for transgenic plants carrying the pAG::GUS construct was also investigated in detail by examining sections of embedded, stained tissue. The inflorescence meristem did not stain for GUS, although a low level of diffuse staining was occasionally observed in the stem below the meristem, as shown in Figure 4A. No staining was detected in stage 2 flowers (Figure 4A). For stages 3 through 6, the staining pattern was somewhat variable. A diffuse and somewhat patchy GUS staining pattern first appears in stage 3 flowers; we have observed that staining is occasionally more intense in the floral meristem, but just as often it shows no spatial restriction. Figure 4A shows a stage 4 flower with a moderate amount of stain distributed in a nearly uniform pattern. Between stages 5 and 8, a punctate pattern of intensely stained cells appears in four positions.
around the base of the flower, shown in a stage 6 flower in Figure 4B and a stage 9 flower in Figure 4C. These intensely staining cells appear to be centered at the junction between the sepal base and the floral meristem and extend into both the sepal and the receptacle. GUS staining in the stamens was variable in young flowers (the stage 6 flower in Figure 4B shows intense staining only in one of the two developing stamens shown in that section), but by stage 8, abundant staining is uniformly distributed throughout the stamens (data not shown). In the developing carpels, no GUS expression was seen until late in development (Figures 4B and 4C). No GUS staining was detectable in petals, as is shown for petal primordia (Figures 4B and 4C) and in the mature flower (Figures 2B, 2D, and 4D). GUS staining in the sepals was first detected at stage 5. At this stage, staining appeared along the apex of the lateral sepal that immediately overlays the carpel (Figure 4B) and at the sepal base. Staining becomes detectable at the apex of all the sepals in flowers between stages 5 and 9 (Figure 4C). Between stages 10 and 12, the GUS staining domain rapidly expands to encompass the entire sepal (Figure 4D).

Late in flower development, abundant GUS staining was observed in stamens of pAG::GUS plants. GUS staining is essentially uniform during the time of rapid stamen expansion (stages 8 to 12), except that it is largely excluded from the developing pollen grains (Figures 4C and 4D). In intact tissue, it is readily apparent that at anthesis, the level of GUS staining in the stamens is much higher in plants carrying the pAG::GUS transgene than in those with the pAG-l::GUS transgene (compare Figures 2D and 2E).

Carpels late in development showed a complex pattern of GUS staining in pAG::GUS plants. At stage 11, GUS staining suddenly and transiently appears in the transmitting tract (Figure 4F); this staining declines during stage 12 (data not shown). Within the ovules, GUS staining was not detected until stage 12, when it was frequently observed within the nucellus (compare Figure 4F, showing a stage 11 flower, with Figure 4G, showing a stage 12 flower). By stage 17, the

---

**Figure 4.** GUS Staining Patterns from Plants Carrying the pAG::GUS Transgene.

(A) Longitudinal section through an inflorescence meristem. GUS staining is not apparent in the stage 2 flower, but a low level of GUS staining is visible below the inflorescence meristem. In this section, staining is almost uniform in the stage 4 flower.

(B) An early stage 6 flower showing a small amount of staining in the apex of the sepal immediately overlaying the developing carpels. Essentially no staining is visible in the developing carpel, and variable staining can be seen in the developing stamens. Note the bright spot of staining immediately below the sepal on the right.

(C) GUS staining in a stage 9 flower showing a pattern similar to that seen at stage 6, except that the staining of the stamen is less variable.

(D) A portion of a stage 12 flower showing abundant staining in the stamen and sepal but no staining in the petal.

(E) A longitudinal section of the apex of a carpel showing staining in the stigma but no detectable staining in the style or developing ovules.

(F) A section through a carpel of a stage 11 flower. GUS staining is abundant in the transmitting tract but not in the ovules.

(G) Ovules within a stage 12 flower showing GUS staining within the nucellus.

(H) GUS staining within the stage 17 ovule is restricted to the micropylar end of the integuments.

Bars = 100 μm.
only ovular GUS staining that could be detected was in the integuments around the micropyle (Figure 4H). These patterns of GUS staining all differ from the normal AG RNA abundance pattern (Bowman et al., 1991; Drews et al., 1991) and the pattern of staining conferred by the pAG-1::GUS construct. Thus, the normal pattern of AG expression within the ovule must require sequences within the 3.8-kb intragenic region. In contrast, GUS staining in the stigmatic papillae and in the nectaries of both pAG::GUS and pAG-1::GUS plants (Figures 3C, 4E, and data not shown) is indistinguishable from the normal pattern of AG RNA abundance (Bowman et al., 1991). Thus, these two aspects of late expression must be conferred by the upstream sequences that are contained in the pAG::GUS construct.

GUS Staining Patterns in ap2, lug, and clf Mutants

The requirement for intragenic sequences to confer many elements of the normal pattern of AG expression led us to question whether any of the known regulators of AG expression act on intragenically located cis elements. Two negative regulators of AG function within the flower. In plants carrying mutations in either the AP2 or the LUG gene, the onset of AG by expression is slightly earlier than that seen in the wild type (stage 2 versus stage 3 in the wild type; Drews et al., 1991; Liu and Meyerowitz, 1995). In strong ap2 mutants, AG RNA was detected in all four whorls, whereas in strong lug mutants, AG RNA localization in ectopic positions was more variable. In lug mutants, AG RNA has been detected predominantly along the margins of first-whorl organs (Liu and Meyerowitz, 1995).

Each of the AG reporter gene constructs was crossed to plants with the strong mutant alleles ap2-2 and lug-3, and homozygous mutants containing the transgene were obtained. If the wild-type products of these genes were to regulate AG by using upstream sequences, then we would expect to see an enlarged GUS staining domain for plants carrying both the pAG::GUS and the pAG-1::GUS constructs. Alternatively, if regulation by these genes were to require intragenically located cis sequences, then only the pAG-1::GUS construct would be expected to respond to the loss of the negative regulators.

Flowers from ap2-2 pAG-1::GUS plants produced intense GUS staining, with the staining product appearing within 3 hr. This staining appeared at least 5 hr earlier than it did in either wild-type pAG-1::GUS flowers or ap2-2 pAG::GUS flowers (data not shown). Figure 5A shows a section through

![Figure 5](image-url)

Figure 5. GUS Staining Patterns in ap2-2 and lug-3 Plants Carrying the pAG-1::GUS and pAG::GUS Transgenes.

(A) A section through an ap2-2 pAG-1::GUS inflorescence showing stage 2, stage 3, and stage 6 flowers.
(B) Another ap2-2 pAG-1::GUS inflorescence showing flowers at stages 4 and 5.
(C) A section through an ap2-2 pAG::GUS inflorescence showing the GUS staining pattern in flowers at stages 2, 3, 6, and 8.
(D) The GUS staining pattern of a lug-3 pAG-1::GUS inflorescence. Flowers at late stage 2 and stage 3 show abundant GUS staining throughout the floral meristem.
(E) A lug-3 pAG-1::GUS flower at stage 6 showing GUS staining in one of the two sepals in this section.
(F) A section through a lug-3 pAG::GUS inflorescence showing the GUS staining pattern in stage 4 and stage 6 flowers.
Figure 6. GUS Staining Patterns in Leaves of clf-2 and CLF Plants Carrying the pAG-l::GUS and pAG::GUS Transgenes.

(A) A GUS-stained leaf from a pAG-l::GUS plant in which no staining is visible.
(B) A clf-2 plant carrying the pAG-l::GUS transgene shows GUS staining in the leaves.
(C) A higher magnification view of a GUS-stained leaf of a clf-2 pAG-l::GUS plant shows that GUS staining occurs primarily around the margins of the leaf.
(D) A GUS-stained leaf from a pAG::GUS plant.
(E) A clf-2 plant carrying the pAG::GUS transgene.
(F) A higher magnification view of a GUS-stained leaf of a clf-2 pAG::GUS plant shows a small amount of GUS staining along the curled margins of the leaf.

an ap2-2 pAG-l::GUS inflorescence containing a stage 2 and early stage 3 flower. No GUS staining can be seen in the stage 2 flower, whereas the stage 3 flower has intense GUS staining throughout the floral meristem and the emerging sepal primordia. Slightly older stage 4 and stage 5 flowers are shown in Figure 5B. Abundant GUS staining is evident throughout the entire developing flowers. The staining pattern observed for ap2-2 pAG::GUS flowers is shown in Figure 5C. Staining is diffuse in the developing flowers. In young flowers, it appears primarily at the base of the sepals (in a punctate pattern). In older flowers, GUS staining appears in a pattern consistent with the cell-type specific staining seen in fourth-whorl organs of the wild type (data not shown). Thus, only the pAG-l::GUS construct responds to the loss of the AP2 regulator, indicating that negative regulation of AG by AP2 must require DNA sequences located within the 3.8-kb intragenic region.

Similar results were obtained for GUS expression in lug-3 mutants. A section containing a late stage 2 flower and a late stage 3 flower of a GUS-stained lug-3 pAG-l::GUS inflorescence is shown in Figure 5D. GUS staining is evident throughout the apex of the late stage 2 flower and is clearly visible in the sepal primordia of the stage 3 flower. In the stage 6 flower shown in Figure 5E, GUS staining can be seen in the developing stamens and carpels as well as one of the sepals. In contrast, the lug-3 pAG::GUS inflorescences show diffuse low-intensity staining in young flowers (data not shown). In slightly older flowers, a patchy pattern of staining that is similar to wild-type pAG::GUS staining is evident. In Figure 5F, a stage 4 flower shows diffuse staining, primarily in the carpel primordia. In the stage 6 flower, GUS staining appears primarily in a punctate pattern at the base of the developing sepals. These data show that only the pAG-l::GUS construct contains the cis sequences that allow a response to the loss of the LUG negative regulator.

CLF is another negative regulator of AG (Coupland et al., 1993). In plants carrying mutations in the clf gene, AG RNA is detected in vegetative organs (Coupland et al., 1993). To determine whether the CLF gene uses intragenic sequences for its regulation of AG RNA, both the pAG-l::GUS and the pAG::GUS constructs were crossed to plants carrying the clf-2 mutation, and homozygous mutants carrying the transgenes were obtained. The GUS staining patterns observed in these plants are shown in Figure 6. Plants carrying the pAG-l::GUS construct do not normally show vegetative GUS staining (Figure 2A, plant at right, and Figure 6A). In a clf-2 mutant, however, abundant vegetative GUS staining can be readily observed (Figures 6B and 6C). Plants carrying the
pAG::GUS transgene normally show GUS staining in leaves (Figure 2A, plant at left, and Figure 6D). In clf-2 mutants, however, the vegetative GUS staining was slightly reduced (Figures 6E and 6F). That only the construct with the intragenic region responds to the loss of clf activity by gaining GUS expression in the leaves shows that like AP2 and LUG, CLF uses intragenic sequences to regulate AG expression.

**DISCUSSION**

The importance of intragenic sequences for conferring a normal pattern of AG expression was shown by comparing two AG::GUS expression patterns. GUS fusion constructs that contain -6 kb of upstream sequences and -3.8 kb of intragenic sequences of AG (pAG-I::GUS; Figure 1B) confer a staining pattern that is indistinguishable from the wild-type AG in situ hybridization pattern (Bowman et al., 1991; Drews et al., 1991), except for some GUS staining seen in the tapetum. Thus, those 9.8 kb of upstream and intragenic sequences must contain all of the promoter and enhancer elements required for accurate temporal and spatial regulation of both early and late AG expression. To gain insight into the activities of intragenic and upstream control elements, we analyzed the GUS staining patterns that result when the intragenic region is missing.

**Intragenic Sequences Are Required to Prevent Vegetative Expression**

Accumulation of the GUS staining product in the vegetative tissues (leaf blades, the shoot apical meristem, and along the stem) of pAG::GUS plants stands out in marked contrast to transgenic plants that ectopically express AG (Mandel et al., 1993). These results suggest that the 3.8 kb of intragenic sequences that contain the pAG-I::GUS construct may contain the cis elements used by the CLF gene product to repress AG expression in vegetative tissues. This suggestion was confirmed by the observation that only plants carrying the pAG-I::GUS transgene showed a gain of GUS staining in leaves of clf-2 plants.

**AG Expression Early in Flower Development Requires Intragenic Sequences**

Both spatial and temporal control of AG expression in early flower development also require intragenic sequences. Plants carrying the pAG::GUS construct showed a variable pattern of GUS staining in early flowers that was generally of low intensity and not clearly restricted to the central region of the flower meristem (Figure 4A). This pattern is similar to the AG in situ hybridization pattern observed in flowers from plants carrying mutations in the genes that encode two positive regulators of AG expression, ap1 and Ify (Weigel and Meyerowitz, 1993). These results suggest that the target sites for these two gene products might lie within the 3.8 kb of intragenic sequences that contain the pAG-I::GUS construct.

The spatial pattern of early AG expression also requires intragenic sequences, because the pattern of GUS staining in the pAG::GUS plants deviates from the AG in situ hybridization pattern (Drews et al., 1991; Figures 4A to 4C). Normally, AG is uniformly expressed at high levels in both the stamens and carpels, beginning at a stage before their morphological differentiation. In contrast, for pAG::GUS plants, GUS staining in the fourth-whorl carpels did not appear until late stage 11; yet, in the third whorl, abundant GUS staining was observed in the stamens by stage 8. These differences in third- and fourth-whorl staining patterns suggest that AG gene expression is controlled independently in each of these whorls. A control element (located in the upstream region) may positively regulate AG expression in developing stamens. The lack of GUS staining in the carpels of pAG::GUS plants may be a consequence of the lack of activation in the floral meristem, as described above, or it might indicate that an additional control element for positive regulation in developing carpels is located in the intragenic region. No specific candidates for genes that might serve as specific positive regulators of AG expression in developing stamens or carpels have been identified.

In contrast, two genes have been identified as negative regulators of AG expression in early flower development: AP2 and LUG (Drews et al., 1991; Liu and Meyerowitz, 1995). That only the gene fusion containing intragenic sequences can respond to the loss of either of these genes (by expanding its expression domain early in development) leads to the formal conclusion that intragenic sequences are required for the regulation of AG by these two regulators. What we cannot determine from the data, however, is whether this is a direct requirement for cis elements located within the intragenic region. It is possible that the intragenically located domain for activation of AG early in flower development is a prerequisite for negative regulation, in which case the precise location of sequences used by AP2 and LUG for negative regulation could reside either intragenically or upstream. Alternatively, it may be that the lack of expansion of GUS staining in the ap2-2 pAG::GUS and the lug-3 pAG::GUS plants reflects a direct requirement for cis se-
quences within the intragenic region. Precise localization of the cis sequences used by AP2 and LUG requires a detailed mutagenesis analysis. This work is currently in progress.

**Late AG Expression Is Complex**

The GUS staining patterns of pAG::GUS and pAG::GUS suggest a much more complicated control of late AG expression in the carpel than was suspected on the basis of the AG in situ hybridization (Bowman et al., 1991). GUS staining was detected in the stigmatic papillae of both pAG::GUS (Figure 4E) and pAG::GUS (Figure 3C) plants; however, this is the only element of late AG carpel expression that is conserved in pAG::GUS. pAG::GUS plants lack the stylar staining that can be seen in pAG::GUS plants (Figures 3C and 4E); instead, they show transient GUS staining in the transmitting tract of stage 11 flowers (Figure 4F). Within the developing ovules, the GUS staining pattern in pAG::GUS plants also deviates markedly from the wild-type AG expression pattern (Figures 4F to 4H). No GUS staining was detected in young ovules (stages 9 to 11) at the time when in the wild type, AG RNA is uniformly distributed. At a slightly later stage (stage 12), strong GUS staining was detected in the nucellus (Figure 4G). This is also a transient expression pattern, and by the time the ovule had matured, the only ovular GUS staining that could be observed was in the integuments adjacent to the micropyle (Figure 4H). These results indicate that sequences upstream of AG contain cis elements that activate gene expression within the transmitting tract, nucellus, and parts of the integuments. Sequences located intragenically must be required to initiate the early ovular expression pattern and to repress expression patterns in the transmitting tract, nucellus, and integument.

The only gene that has been suggested to regulate AG expression during ovule development is BELL1 (BEL1). This assignment as a negative regulator of AG is based on the observation that in bel1 mutants, AG transcripts fail to accumulate specifically in the endothelium but rather remain in a uniform pattern throughout the ovule (Modrusan et al., 1994; Ray et al., 1994). More recently, it has been suggested that this effect on AG expression is not direct, because expression domains of AG and BEL1 overlap in wild-type flowers (Reiser et al., 1995). The fact that removal of the intragenic region from the AG::GUS gene fusions results in a much more complex GUS staining pattern than mere loss of the negative regulation supports the idea that additional regulators of AG expression late in ovule development remain to be identified.

**Evolutionary Conservation of Intragenic Control Elements**

In general, cis elements required for gene expression are found in regions upstream (5') from the transcriptional start site; however, it is not uncommon to find control elements located downstream (3') of a gene as well (Dietrich et al., 1992; Larkin et al., 1993). Much less common are regulatory control elements located within a gene. In Drosophila, several genes have been identified that contain regulatory control elements within a gene. For instance, the first intron of the tropomyosin 1 gene contains both positive and negative cis-acting elements that confer both temporal and muscle-specific expression patterns (Gremke et al., 1993). Similarly, the β3 tubulin gene contains an enhancer within its first intron that regulates expression along the anterior-posterior axis (Hinz et al., 1992).

In plants, the presence of the first intron has been correlated with enhanced levels of gene expression for several different genes in monocots (Callis et al., 1987; Luehrsen and Walbot, 1991). For these monocot genes, deletion of the intron does not influence expression levels when the gene is placed in dicot cells. Roles of intron sequences in expression of genes for dicot species are less clear cut. The polyubiquitin genes of Arabidopsis contain an intron that is reported to enhance expression levels in transient assays (Norris et al., 1993); however, for expression of the polyubiquitin gene from Nicotiana tabacum, the similarly positioned intron is apparently dispensable (Genschik et al., 1994). In potato, the sucrose synthase genes Sus3 and Sus4 each contain an intron in their 5' leader that has been shown to be essential for normal developmental regulation (Fu et al., 1995a, 1995b). However, normal expression of many dicot genes has been shown to require only upstream sequences, including the Arabidopsis MADS box gene APETALA3 (Jack et al., 1994).

The homolog of AG from Antirrhinum, PLENA (PLE), has a genomic organization that is nearly identical to that of AG (Bradley et al., 1993). Two classes of mutant alleles have been identified: recessive (ple) alleles show an ag-like phenotype, with indeterminate flowers composed solely of sepals and petals, whereas semidominant (ovulata) alleles show homeotic conversions of the first-whorl sepals to carpels and of the second-whorl petals to stamens. Consistent with the ABC model for floral organ specification (reviewed in Weigel and Meyerowitz, 1994), ectopic expression of PLE in the outer two whorls (and vegetative parts of the plant) has been observed in plants with the ovulata phenotype. Both of these two complementary phenotypes arise from TAM3 transposable element insertions into the large second intron (Bradley et al., 1993).

Two general models to account for the alternative phenotypes feature either the disruption of cis-acting elements essential for normal expression located within the large second intron or influences on PLE expression derived from the transposon itself. The demonstration that the recessive ple-type alleles have TAM3 inserted so that transcription would occur in the same orientation as the gene and that the dominant ovulata-type alleles carry TAM3 insertions in the opposite orientation supports a role for transposon structure or activity in the mutant phenotypes.
We have shown that intragenic sequences are essential for normal AG expression. In Arabidopsis, loss of this region results in both loss of negative control over spatial distribution of expression (both floral and vegetative) and loss of positive regulation, especially activation in the floral meristem. Recently, using similar approaches, we have shown that essential intragenic cis sequences are restricted to the second large intron (M.K. Deyholos and L.E. Sieburth, manuscript in preparation). A comparison of the large introns of AG and PLE shows dozens of short stretches (up to 12 nucleotides) of sequence identity throughout the large second intron. The potential significance of these alignments is unclear. These large introns are highly AT rich (72% for AG and 70% for PLE), and the precise positions of TAM3 insertions that cause the ovulata phenotype in Antirrhinum have not been reported. Future dissection of the intragenic control region of AG should provide insights into AG regulatory circuits, and comparisons with Antirrhinum may provide insights into aspects of these regulatory circuits that are conserved between these two divergent angiosperm species.

METHODS

AGAMOUS:β-Glucuronidase Gene Fusion Constructs

Two constructs that fused portions of AGAMOUS (AG) to β-glucuronidase (GUS) were constructed using a polymerase chain reaction (PCR)-mediated fusion strategy. First, GUS and portions of AG were amplified using oligonucleotides that conferred ~30 bp of overlap to the two initial products. A second round of amplification using the two initial products and the two outer oligonucleotides generated the final fused product. Specifically, for pAG::GUS, the initial AG product was amplified from plasmid pBS5104 (described below) by using oligonucleotides AG-GUS2 5'-GGACGTAACATCGGGGAGAAG-AACAA-3' (underlined portions of oligonucleotides indicate the region containing homology to the GUS coding region) and LS106 5'-TACATTCCCTTTATTAGITGAAC-3'. The initial GUS fragment was amplified from the pBl22 plasmid (Clontech, Palo Alto, CA) by using oligonucleotides AG-GUS1 5'-CTCCCCCCCATGTTACGTCTCTGAAAC-3' and the M13 reverse primer. The two initial PCR products were mixed, and the fusion product was obtained by amplifying with only oligonucleotides for LS106 and M13 reverse primer. This fusion product was assembled with an additional 6 kb of the upstream region of AG obtained from clone pBS5104. The fusion product was cloned into the plant transformation vector pCGN1547 (McBride and Summerfelt, 1990) as an Asp718 fragment.

The second AG::GUS fusion was constructed with the fusion site at the beginning of the third exon. PCR-mediated gene fusion was performed as given above, except that oligonucleotides AgGUS4 5'-GACGTACATCTGGCAATGTATTATTAG-3' and AgSeq-25 5'-TTTAGTACGGATCCATTAG-3' were used to amplify the AG portion from the cosmid pCIT540 (Yanofsky et al., 1990). Oligonucleotides for AgGUS3 5'-ACTATTGCAGTATGTTACGTCCTGTAG-3' and the M13 reverse primer were used to amplify the GUS coding region. The fusion product was assembled in the plant transformation vector pCGN1547 with the same upstream region of AG used in the pAG::GUS fusion. This fusion product also included the genomic region between the first and the third exons. The upstream region of AG was obtained from pLAGE13, which is an EcoRI subclone from cosmid N71 (from G. Drews, University of Utah, Salt Lake City). Linkers were used to convert the XbaI site ~5.5 kb upstream of the Psfl site to Asp718. The 4-kb Psfl-HindIII fragment was purified from cosmid pCIT540. These two fragments were ligated into the Asp718 and BamHI sites of pBluescript SK+ (Stratagene, La Jolla, CA) to make pBS-5104.

Plant Transformation

Lines of transgenic plants carrying each construct were established using Agrobacterium tumefaciens-mediated transformation. Root tissue of the Arabidopsis thaliana ecotype Nossen (No-0) was cultured in liquid medium and used for transformation after established protocols (Valvekens et al., 1988). The insert copy number has been assessed by analysis of kanamycin resistance segregation.

GUS Staining

Tissue for GUS staining was gently fixed by incubation in 90% acetone, on ice, for 15 to 20 min and then rinsed in 50 mM NaPO4, pH 7.2, 0.5 mM K4Fe(CN)6, and 0.5 mM K3Fe(CN)6. The tissue was then placed in staining solution (50 mM NaPO4, pH 7.2, 2 mM X-gluс [Gold Biotechnology, St. Louis, MO], 0.5 mM K4Fe(CN)6, and 0.5 mM K3Fe(CN)6, vacuum infiltrated, and incubated at 37°C overnight. After staining, the tissue was processed through an ethanol series (30, 50, 70, 85, 95, 100, and 100%), with the 50% step of the series replaced by a 1-hr formaldehyde-acetic acid fixation (50% ethanol, 5% acetic acid, and 3.7% formaldehyde). To prepare tissue for histological analysis, we passed tissue through a xylene series and embedded it in Paraplast (Sigma). Sections (10 μm) were cut from the embedded tissue, wax was removed by a brief incubation in xylene, and sections were mounted in Paraplast. Sections were visualized using dark-field illumination.

Image Processing

Slides were scanned using a Coolscan (Nikon, Inc., Melville, NY), with brightness and contrast adjusted with Adobe Photoshop 2.5 (Mountain View, CA). Figures 2 to 6 were printed using a digital printer (model XLS 8300; Eastman Kodak, Rochester, NY).

Plant Material

All plants were grown in constant light at 25°C in a 1:1:1 mix of vermiculite, perlite, and potting soil. Transgenic seeds were selected by germination on medium containing a 0.5 × Murashige and Skoog basal salt mixture (Sigma), 50 μg/mL kanamycin, and 0.7% phytagar (Gibco BRL, Grand Island, NY). Approximately 8 days after germination, transgenic seedlings were identified by their long roots and production of green true leaves.
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