

IMAGINAL DISCS

With the elucidation of the complete fly genome, traditional fly genetics is in more demand than ever. Genetics will allow us to explain the role of each of the 14,000 genes, many of which are involved in the development of imaginal discs. These hollow sacs of cells make adult structures during metamorphosis, and their study is crucial to comprehending how a larva becomes a fully functioning fly.

This book examines the genetic circuitry of the well-known “fruit fly,” tackling questions of cell assemblage and pattern formation, of the hows and the whys behind the development of the fly. The book first establishes that fly development relies primarily on intercellular signaling, and then discusses how this signaling occurs. After an initial examination of the proximity versus pedigree imperatives, the book delves into bristle pattern formation and disc development, with entire chapters devoted to the leg, wing, and eye. Extensive appendices include a glossary of protein domains, catalogs of well-studied genes, and an outline of signaling pathways. More than 30 wiring diagrams, among 67 detailed schematics, clarify the text. The text goes beyond the Internet databases insofar as it puts these myriad facts into both a conceptual framework and a historical context. Overall, the aim is to provide a comprehensive reference guide for students and researchers exploring this fascinating, but often bewildering, field.

Lewis I. Held, Jr., is Associate Professor in the Department of Biological Sciences at Texas Tech University.

Developmental and Cell Biology Series

SERIES EDITORS
Jonathan B. L. Bard, *Department of Anatomy, Edinburgh University*
Peter W. Barlow, *Long Ashton Research Station, University of Bristol*
David L. Kirk, *Department of Biology, Washington University*

The aim of the series is to present relatively short critical accounts of areas of developmental and cell biology where sufficient information has accumulated to allow a considered distillation of the subject. The fine structure of cells, embryology, morphology, physiology, genetics, biochemistry and biophysics are subjects within the scope of the series. The books are intended to interest and instruct advanced undergraduates and graduate students and to make an important contribution to teaching cell and developmental biology. At the same time, they should be of value to biologists who, while not working directly in the area of a particular volume's subject matter, wish to keep abreast of developments relevant to their particular interests.

BOOKS IN THE SERIES		
18.	C. J. Epstein <i>The Consequences of Chromosome Imbalance: Principles, Mechanisms and Models</i>	0 521 25464 7
19.	L. Saxén <i>Organogenesis of the Kidney</i>	0 521 30152 1
20.	V. Raghavan <i>Developmental Biology of the Fern Gametophytes</i>	0 521 33022 X
21.	R. Maksymowych <i>Analysis of Growth and Development in Xanthium</i>	0 521 35327 0
22.	B. John <i>Meiosis</i>	0 521 35053 0
23.	J. Bard <i>Morphogenesis: The Cellular and Molecular Processes of Developmental Anatomy</i>	0 521 43612 5
24.	R. Wall <i>This Side Up: Spatial Determination in the Early Development of Animals</i>	0 521 36115 X
25.	T. Sachs <i>Pattern Formation in Plant Tissues</i>	0 521 24865 5
26.	J. M. W. Slack <i>From Egg to Embryo: Regional Specification in Early Development</i>	0 521 40943 8
27.	A. I. Farbman <i>Cell Biology of Olfaction</i>	0 521 36438 8
28.	L. G. Harrison <i>Kinetic Theory of Living Pattern</i>	0 521 30691 4
29.	N. Satoh <i>Developmental Biology of Ascidians</i>	0 521 35221 5
30.	R. Holliday <i>Understanding Ageing</i>	0 521 47802 2
31.	P. Tsonis <i>Limb Regeneration</i>	0 521 44149 8
32.	R. Rappaport <i>Cytokinesis in Animal Cells</i>	0 521 40173 9
33.	D. L. Kirk <i>Volvox: Molecular Genetic Origins of Multicellularity and Cellular Differentiation</i>	0 521 45207 4
34.	R. L. Lyndon <i>The Shoot Apical Meristem: Its Growth and Development</i>	0 521 40457 6
35.	D. Moore <i>Fungal Morphogenesis</i>	0 521 55295 8
36.	N. Le Douarin & C. Kalcheim <i>The Neural Crest, Second Edition</i>	0 521 62010 4
37.	P. R. Gordon-Weeks <i>Neuronal Growth Cones</i>	0 521 44491 8
38.	R. Kessin <i>Dictyostelium</i>	0 521 58364 0
39.	L. I. Held, Jr. <i>Imaginal Discs: The Genetic and Cellular Logic of Pattern Formation</i>	0 521 58445 0



Thomas Hunt Morgan (3rd from right) and his associates at Columbia University. This luncheon was held in the “Chart Room” on 2 January 1919, to celebrate the return of Alfred Henry Sturtevant (foreground with beer and cigar) from his brief stint as a soldier in World War I [72, 651, 1556, 2283]. Calvin Bridges (center) is feigning a chat with a museum mannequin (*Homo erectus*) dressed in Sturt’s uniform. Clockwise from this anthropoid “guest” are Hermann J. Muller, T. H. Morgan (“the Boss”), Frank E. Lutz, Otto L. Mohr, Alfred F. Huettnner, A. H. Sturtevant, Franz Schrader, Ernest G. Anderson, Alexander Weinstein, S. C. Dellinger, and Calvin B. Bridges. Curt Stern (not shown) did not join the team until 1924 [3071]. This merry band of pioneers launched a great quest for the secrets of genetics, and they had a knack for solving mysteries that rivaled Sherlock Holmes [72, 650, 651, 2951, 4182, 4184]. Nevertheless, as the informality of this party indicates, these legendary heroes did not take themselves too seriously [72, 3903]. Indeed, their lightheartedness has suffused this field ever since [4696] and is reflected in the whimsical names of many fly genes [2561]. Most of the mutations they studied affect the adult’s anatomy by altering the development of the larva’s imaginal discs. Those discs are the subject of this book, one of whose aims is to celebrate the triumph of the quest. This picture is from Sturt’s photo album. It was provided courtesy of the Archives, California Institute of Technology.

IMAGINAL DISCS

The Genetic and Cellular Logic of
Pattern Formation

LEWIS I. HELD, JR.

Texas Tech University





Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 8EA, United Kingdom
One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA
477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia
314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre, New Delhi – 110025, India
103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.
We share the University's mission to contribute to society through the pursuit of education, learning and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521584456

© Lewis I. Held, Jr. 2002

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press & Assessment.

First published 2002
First paperback edition 2005

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data
Held, Lewis I., 1951–

Imaginal discs : the genetic and cellular logic of pattern formation / Lewis I. Held, Jr.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-521-58445-0

1. *Drosophila melanogaster* – Genetics. 2. *Drosophila melanogaster* – Embryology.
3. *Drosophila melanogaster* – Morphogenesis – Molecular aspects. 4. Cellular signal transduction. 5. Cell interaction. I. Title.

QH470.D7 H45 2002

576.5 – dc21

2001043553

ISBN 978-0-521-58445-6 Hardback

ISBN 978-0-521-01835-7 Paperback

Cambridge University Press & Assessment has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	<i>page xi</i>
CHAPTER ONE. CELL LINEAGE VS. INTERCELLULAR SIGNALING	1
Discs are not clones	1
No part of a disc is a clone, except claws and tiny sense organs	4
Cells belong to lineage “compartments”	4
CHAPTER TWO. THE BRISTLE	5
Numb segregates asymmetrically and dictates bristle cell fates	5
Delta needs to activate Notch, but not as a signal per se	9
Amnesic cells can use sequential gating to simulate a binary code	10
Notch must go to the nucleus to function	12
E(spl)-C genes are Su(H) targets but play no role in the SOP lineage	15
The transcription factor Tramtrack implements some cell identities	18
Hairless titrates Su(H)	20
Several other genes help determine the 5 cell fates	23
Pox neuro and Cut specify bristle type	27
Bract cells are induced by bristle cells	28
Macrochaetes and microchaetes differ in size but not in kind	29
CHAPTER THREE. BRISTLE PATTERNS	31
Surprisingly, different macrochaete sites use different signals	33
Prepatterns may contain hidden “singularities”	36
How Achaete and Scute control bristles was debated for decades	36
In 1989, Achaete and Scute were found to mark “proneural clusters”	43
In 1995, the old AS-C paradigm toppled and a new one emerged	44
Proneural “spots” shrink to SOP “dots”	45
The SOP uses a feedback loop to raise its Ac and Sc levels	48
Two other bHLH genes (<i>asense</i> and <i>daughterless</i>) assist SOPs	48

“Lateral” or “mutual” inhibition ensures one SOP per PNC	49
Notch-pathway and proneural genes are functionally coupled	50
Doses of Notch-pathway genes can bias the SOP decision	52
Extra SOPs could be inhibited by contact or diffusion (or both)	52
Scabrous may be the diffusible SOP inhibitor	53
Inhibitory fields dictate the spacing intervals of microchaetes	55
Microchaetes come from proneural stripes, not spots	57
Hairy paints “antineural” stripes on the legs	61
Leg bristles use extra fine-tuning tricks	62
Chemosensory leg bristles are patterned like notal macrochaetes	67
Extramacrochaetae superimposes an uneven antineural “mask”	68
Dose dependency implies that HLH proteins “compute” bristles	71
Robustness of patterning may be due to a tolerant time window	73
Atonal and Amos are proneural agents for other types of sensilla	74
Other (upstream) pathways govern bristle patterning	75
 CHAPTER FOUR. ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF DISCS	 76
Segmentation genes set the stage for disc initiation	76
Prepatterns and gradients clashed in trying to explain homeosis	80
Homeotic genes implement regional identities	84
Wing and haltere discs “grow out” from 2nd- and 3rd-leg discs	85
Thoracic discs arise at Wingless/Engrailed boundaries	87
Cell lineage within compartments is indeterminate	91
The Polar Coordinate Model linked regeneration to development	92
But regeneration has peculiarities that set it apart	96
 CHAPTER FIVE. THE LEG DISC	 97
The Molecular Epoch of disc research was launched in 1991	97
Bateson’s Rule (1894) governs symmetry planes in branched legs	99
Meinhardt’s Boundary Model deftly explained Bateson’s Rule	100
The Boundary and PC Models jousted in a “Paradigm War”	103
Hh, Dpp, and Wg are the chief intercellular signaling molecules	105
P-type cells use Hh to “talk” to A-type cells nearby	107
Hh elicits expression of Dpp and Wg along the A/P boundary	109
Dpp dorsalizes and Wg ventralizes, or do they?	111
Dpp and Wg are mutually antagonistic	114
Dpp and Wg jointly initiate distal outgrowth	115
But Dpp seems more crucial than Wg as a growth factor	118
The A/P boundary can migrate when its “jailors” are “asleep”	119
Regeneration is due to a Hh spot in the peripodial membrane	122
The Polar Coordinate Model died in 1999	123
How Hh, Dpp, and Wg move is not known, nor is their range	124
Whether Dpp and Wg travel along curved paths is not known	125
Hairy links global to local patterning	128
Questions remain about the Hh-Dpp-Wg circuitry	128
Distal-less is necessary and sufficient for distalization	129

CONTENTS

Proximal and distal cells have different affinities	132
Dachshund is induced at the Homothorax/Distal-less interface	132
Homothorax and Extradenticle govern the proximal disc region	133
Fasciclin II is induced at the BarH1/Aristaless interface	134
BarH1 and Bric à brac affect P-D identity, joints, and folds	135
Leg segmentation requires Notch signaling	135
 CHAPTER SIX. THE WING DISC	 137
The A-P axis is governed by Hh and Dpp but not by Wg	137
Dpp turns on <i>omb</i> and <i>spalt</i> at different thresholds	140
Dpp regulates <i>omb</i> and <i>spalt</i> similarly despite clues to the contrary	143
Dpp does not regulate <i>tkv</i> in 3rd instar despite clues to the contrary	143
A vs. P identities might explain how a straight A/P line emerges	148
But the A/P line appears to straighten via a signaling mechanism	149
Intercalation is due to a tendency of Dpp gradients to rise	153
The variable height of Dpp gradients makes them appear seamless	155
A Wg gradient specifies cell fates along the wing's D-V axis	156
Perpendicular (Dpp × Wg) gradients suggest Cartesian coordinates	157
But cells do not seem to record positional values per se	158
Wg's repression of Dfz2 is inconsequential	158
Apterous's role along the D-V axis resembles Engrailed's A-P role	158
Chip cooperates with Apterous, and "Dorsal wing" acts downstream	160
Serrate and Delta prod Notch to evoke Wg at the D/V line	161
Fringe prevents Notch from responding to Serrate	164
The core D-V circuit plugs into a complex network	165
The wing-notum duality is established by Wg and Vein	167
But Vestigial and Scalloped dictate "wingness" per se	171
Straightening of the D/V border requires Notch signaling and Ap	173
Straightening of veins may rely on similar tricks	173
Two cell types predominate in the wing blade: vein and intervein	174
Veins come from proveins that look like proneural fields	175
But the resemblance is only superficial	175
All veins use the EGFR pathway	177
But interveins also use the EGFR pathway (at a later time)	184
Veins 3 and 4 are positioned by the Hh pathway	185
Veins 2 and 5 are positioned by the Dpp pathway	186
The Dpp pathway later implements the vein state	188
A cousin of Dpp (Gbb) fosters the A and P cross-veins	188
Vein 1 uses a combination of Dpp and Wg signals	189
Macrochaetes are sited by various "prepattern" inputs	190
How bristle axons get wired into the CNS is not known	191
 CHAPTER SEVEN. THE EYE DISC	 197
Compound eyes have ~750 facets, with 8 photoreceptors per facet	197
Unlike the bristle, the ommatidium is not a clone	201
The eye has D and V compartments (despite doubts to the contrary)	202

The Iroquois Complex controls D-V polarity via Fringe and Notch	203
A morphogenetic wave creates the ommatidial lattice	208
D-V polarity depends on a rivalry between R3 and R4 precursors	209
R1–R8 cells arise sequentially, implying a cascade of inductions	211
But the final cell (R7) is induced by the first one (R8)	213
Various restraints prevent more than one cell from becoming R7	213
The information content of the inductive signals may be only 1 bit	216
No transcription factor “code” has yet been found for R cells	218
The lattice is created by inhibitory fields around R8 precursors	224
The lattice is tightened when excess cells die	227
Eye bristles arise independently of ommatidia	228
The MF operates like a moving A/P boundary	229
Dpp and Wg control the rate of MF progress	234
The MF originates via different circuitry	234
 CHAPTER EIGHT. HOMEOSIS	 237
BX-C and ANT-C specify gross metameric identities along the body	237
Ubx enables T3 discs to develop differently from T2 discs	243
But Ubx does so by directly managing target genes in multiple echelons	244
Pc-G and Trx-G “memory” proteins keep homeotic genes ON or OFF	247
Homothorax, Distal-less, and Spineless specify leg vs. antennal fates	249
If a “master gene” exists for the eye, then it is also a micromanager	252
The manifold “enhanceosome” is a wondrous Gordian Knot	254
The deepest enigma is how evolution rewired the circuit elements	254
 EPILOGUE	 256
 APPENDIX ONE. Glossary of Protein Domains	 257
APPENDIX TWO. Inventory of Models, Mysteries, Devices, and Epiphanies	266
APPENDIX THREE. Genes That Can Alter Cell Fates Within the (5-Cell) Mechanosensory Bristle Organ	271
APPENDIX FOUR. Genes That Can Transform One Type of Bristle Into Another or Into a Different Type of Sense Organ	276
APPENDIX FIVE. Genes That Can Alter Bristle Number by Directly Affecting SOP Equivalence Groups or Inhibitory Fields	278
APPENDIX SIX. Signal Transduction Pathways: Hedgehog, Decapentaplegic, and Wingless	285
APPENDIX SEVEN. Commentaries on the Pithier Figures	297
 <i>References</i>	 307
<i>Index</i>	441

Preface

How embryos “self-assemble” has fascinated thinkers for millennia [2918, 3064, 3190]. Among the ancient Greeks, Aristotle (384–322 BCE) made copious observations and coined the term “morphogenesis,” which is still in use today [2989, 4305]. For the past century, the science of “developmental mechanics” has hammered at this problem relentlessly, but it is only in the last decade that the core mysteries have finally cracked [1487]. The deepest secrets have come from a fairylike fly named *Drosophila melanogaster*, probably the same species of “gnat” that Aristotle himself noticed hovering over vinegar slime [217, 3361, 4184]. Unfortunately, these insights can only be fully appreciated in the arcane language of fly genetics. Hence this book full of runes and rules.

This book concerns cuticular patterns, the cellular machinery that makes them, and the genetic circuitry that runs the machinery. Although it is mainly a survey, it is also a narrative that traces the roots of our knowledge. The story that it tells – albeit in condensed form – rivals the *Iliad* in scope (legions of researchers devoting decades to attacking thousands of genes) and the *Odyssey* in wonderment (monstrous mutants posing riddles that challenge even the most clever explorer-heroes). Indeed, truth is often stranger than a fairy tale in the realm of the fly. Believe it or not, there are even remote islands where giant drosophilids with dappled wings and feathery legs have been spied dancing and fighting in the misty forests [668, 669].

Ever since 1910 when T. H. Morgan’s first “fly paper” was published [2948], the field of fly genetics has brimmed with intriguing curiosities [820, 2951, 3673] and equally colorful human personalities [120, 327, 2283, 4183]. Added to these delights is a menagerie of recently discovered molecules

– e.g., the midget “Bearded” (81 a.a.) [2499] and the giant “Dumpy” (3680 a.a.) [4668]. Now that the fly genome project is ending [14], the world is peering into this circus. What newcomers may not realize is that this field offers many diversions beyond its databases.

Like other holometabolous insects, flies live two lives – first as a grub, then as a flying adult [82]. During metamorphosis, 19 “imaginal discs” erupt from inside the maggot and are quilted together to form most of the adult skin. The gold-colored cuticle secreted by that skin is exquisitely ornate. The head is embossed with hundreds of domes that focus light onto bundles of photoreceptors, the thorax is sculpted into dozens of jointed parts that form a contraption for walking and flying, and the abdominal wall (built from non-disc tissue [2648]) is pleated into an expansible chamber for digestion and reproduction. Nearly everywhere, the body surface sprouts bristles whose patterns can be as orderly as soldiers on parade.

Why do only some cells make bristles? That is a problem of differentiation. Why do bristles arise only at certain sites? That is a problem of pattern formation, and these questions can be asked for structures in general. Beneath both problems is a coding enigma: how does the fly’s 1-dimensional genome encode the 2-dimensional cuticular landscape? Once, it seemed that each body part might be governed by its own set of genes [4509, 4512], but this notion proved wrong [1094, 1114, 2410, 4643]. In fact, most patterns are built by the same ensembles of genes. These modules arose eons ago in the mythical common ancestor of insects and vertebrates [1439, 3840]. Since then, evolution has customized the circuitry by making new intra- and inter-modular links [968, 1440].

What is the nature of the circuitry, and how does it program cells to “compute” patterns? That is the subject of this book. Topics are arranged roughly in order of increasing complexity. Chapter 1 establishes one simple fact: in contrast to nematodes, flies rely primarily on intercellular signaling (vs. cell lineage) to assign cell fates. The rest of the book traces how signaling occurs. Chapter 2 delves into the 5-cell cluster that constructs a mechanosensory bristle. The bristle is an exception to the signaling rule: its cell fates are dictated almost entirely by lineage. Chapter 3 uses bristle *patterns* to show how cells communicate in populations larger than a bristle but smaller than a disc, and Chapter 4 sets the stage for a discussion of larger-scale patterning by reviewing how discs arise and grow. Chapters 5 to 7 explore how leg, wing, and eye discs use similar toolkits of genes in idiosyncratic ways. The other two major discs – haltere and genital – are excluded because their strategies so closely resemble wing [16, 51, 3875, 4683, 4684] and leg discs [679, 735, 1163, 2343, 2942, 3732], respectively. (Fly genitalia are evolutionarily modified appendages [1137, 1179, 1562].) Chapter 8 contemplates the phenomenon of homeosis in the context of evolution.

Overall, the book’s quest is to understand cellular “epistemology” (what do cells know?) and “psychology” (how do they think?). Its approach involves de- and reconstruction: to cut through the jargon, tease out the facts, and then try to make sense of the models by piecing the clues back together using *a priori* reasoning.

The bad news is that there are so many pieces in the puzzle that persistence will be needed. The good news is that their interactions are so limited that no fancy math is required to learn the rules of the game [3588, 3841]. A recurrent theme in the saga is how cellular riddles were solved by molecular genetics. The abiding moral is that there is much more experimental work to be done if we are to comprehend how the fly’s ~14,000 genes [14, 1559, 3618, 3674] – or a large portion thereof [280, 615, 963, 4273] – are orchestrated during patterning [698, 2162, 2237, 2845, 4084]. In short, the fly still holds many secrets, and genomics will need genetics to ferret them out [465].

Thus, the book is a sampler of case studies and gedanken exercises, not an encyclopedia. That function is served by the Internet databases, and readers should consult two main websites: *FlyBase* (flybase.bio.indiana.edu) [124, 279] and *The Interactive Fly* (sdb.bio.purdue.edu) [484]. Fly lore is best savored by browsing the classics: the 1993 Cold Spring Harbor 2-volume compendium on development [238], its gargan-

antuan 12-volume predecessor *The Genetics and Biology of Drosophila* [122], Mike Ashburner’s huge “handbook” [118], Lindsley and Zimm’s dictionary of fly genes [2561], Bridges and Brehme’s Barnumesque catalog of freakish mutants [470], and the Morgan team’s *magnum opus* of 1925 [2951]. However, the fun of fly research is best portrayed in the charming *Fly* by Martin Brookes (2001, Harper-Collins, N.Y.).

Despite this disclaimer about breadth, a few topics are covered in depth in the appendices. Appendix 1 is a glossary of protein domains. Appendix 2 lists most of the ideas that have guided research in this field. Appendices 3 to 5 catalog the well-studied genes that affect bristles, sensilla, or bristle patterns, and Appendix 6 outlines three of the key signaling pathways in disc development (Hedgehog, Wingless, and Decapentaplegic). The other two pathways are discussed in Chapters 2 (Notch) and 6 (EGFR). Appendix 7 contains additional comments about the figures.

Historically, disc research has been reviewed intermittently. Disc histology was codified by Dietrich Bodenstern in 1950 [377]. Disc development and genetics were surveyed by Gehring and Nöthiger (1973) [1421], Postlethwait and Schneiderman (1973) [3448], Bryant (1978) [526], Shearn (1978) [3881], Poodry (1980) [3422], and Oberlander (1985) [3165]. The first blush of molecular-genetic data was evaluated by Stephen Cohen in 1993 [834], and the fundamentals of signaling were summarized by Seth Blair in 1999 [358]. Two books that nicely bracket the last 30 years of investigation are *The Biology of Imaginal Discs* (1972, H. Ursprung and R. Nöthiger, eds.) [4426] and *Developmental Genetics of Drosophila* (1998, A. Ghysen, ed.) [1452].

Conventional nomenclature is used. Locations of genes are stated in terms of the salivary gland chromosome map [2561]: the 3-part code (e.g., “92E12–14”) denotes the chromosome section (1–20 span the X, 21–60 the 2nd, 61–100 the 3rd, and 101–102 the tiny 4th chromosome), the lettered subdivision (A–F), and the band or range of bands. Genes are italicized, but gene complexes (e.g., Bar-C) are not. All proteins are in plain type. Mutations are superscripted (e.g., *numb*^{LOF}), whereas wild-type alleles are not (*numb*) or are labeled with “+” (*numb*⁺). Null alleles are designated by a “null” or “–” superscript. Most gene names record the dominant (capital) or recessive (lowercase) nature of early mutations (e.g., *Notch* vs. *numb*). Capital “D” (*Drosophila*) is used for paralogs within the species (e.g., *Dfz2* [310] in the *frizzled* series), whereas lowercase “d” refers to

PREFACE

xiii

orthologs of vertebrate genes (e.g., *dTcf* [692, 1517]). Proteins are always capitalized (e.g., Numb).

Given these rules, the normal symbols for *Hairless* (*H*) and *hairy* (*h*) are distinct for the genes but not for the proteins (“H” in both cases), so “H” will be used only for *Hairless*, while “Hairy” will be written out. Likewise, *Beadex* will be written out to avoid confusion with the protein encoded by *bithorax* (both would be “Bx”). Small capitals are employed for Boolean states (ON, OFF), conditions (IF, THEN, NOT), and conjunctions (AND, OR). Amino acid and nucleotide sequences are underlined. Boundaries are denoted by slash marks (e.g., “A/P”) and axes by hyphens (e.g., “A-P”). Short gene names (≤ 5 letters) are not usually abbreviated.

Abbreviations include a.a. (amino acid), AEL (after egg laying), AP (after pupariation) a.k.a. (also known as), b.p. (base pair), h (hour), hs (heat shock), kb (kilobase), kD (kiloDalton), MC (macrochaete), mC (microchaete), St. (stage of embryogenesis), t.s. (temperature-sensitive), pers. comm. (personal communication), and unpub. obs. (unpublished observations). Times (h AEL or h AP) refer to a culture temperature of 25°C, unless stated otherwise. Polypeptide lengths are for the unprocessed (nascent) precursor. Genes that are usually called “neurogenic” (based on mutant phenotype) [436] are here termed “antineural” (based on function) [4387] to contrast them with “proneural” (based on function) genes [2018]. “Eye disc” refers to both the eye and antennal parts, and “wing disc” denotes the entire dorsal mesothoracic disc (wing, notal, and pleural parts). By tradition (quirky though it may be), fate maps employ *left* legs (Ch. 5), *right* wings (Ch. 6), and *left* eyes (Ch. 7) [185, 320, 526, 531], although right eyes are used by some authors [2962].

Readers must be familiar with the basics of fly development [358, 2434, 3517] and the methods of modern genetics [354, 4671], including (1) induction of cell clones by *flp*-mediated recombination [1530–1532, 3952, 4781] and the *flp*-out trick [4159], (2) regional misexpression of genes via *Gal4-UAS* constructs [435, 3857], (3) temporal misexpression via heat-sensitive alleles [4214] or heat-shock promoters [2953], (4) enhancer trapping using *lacZ* reporter genes [278, 329, 1286, 4687], and (5) two-hybrid screening for protein interactions [222, 763, 1228, 1229, 1316].

Wherever possible, circuits are formulated in terms of Boolean logic [399] because this format shows syntax better than the “spaghetti diagrams” of genetics, electronics, or neural networks [2870]. The temptation to compare fly circuits with vertebrate or nematode circuits

is generally resisted here for the sake of conciseness. Such comparisons can be found in Eric Davidson’s book *Genomic Regulatory Systems* [968] and at Tom Brody’s website *The Interactive Fly*.

The term “link” is used in the sense of “causal linkage.” Links are symbolized as “ \rightarrow ” (activation) or “ \dashv ” (inhibition). When a gene is the object (e.g., “Dpp $\rightarrow omb$ ”), the effect is always at the transcriptional level, but pathways may be distilled in terms of either genes (*en* $\dashv ci$ $\rightarrow ptc$) or proteins (En \dashv Ci \rightarrow Ptc), and any attendant ambiguities will be clarified by context. Epistatic links need not be direct. Thus, “*a* $\rightarrow c$ ” could reflect a longer chain such as “*a* $\rightarrow b \rightarrow c$ ” or “*a* $\dashv b \dashv c$.” The reason for listing so many links in this book is to facilitate Aristotle’s goal of delineating the entire chain of causes from the fertilized egg to the adult [1993, 2919, 4305]. Only by concatenating all the known fragments can we see the gaps that remain to be filled.

The terms “LOF” (Loss of Function) and “GOF” (Gain of Function) typically denote decreases or increases in levels of gene activity (i.e., under- or overexpression) [1117, 1455], but in the broader sense that will be used here, GOF also includes ectopic misexpression where the “gain” is regional (cf. Fig. 6.13). For example, clones of cells that express a wild-type allele of *engrailed* (*en*⁺) outside the territory where *en*⁺ is normally transcribed will be called “*en*^{GOF}” [4848]. Cases do arise where overexpressing a wild-type allele has effects that differ from expressing a constitutively active construct [3545], and these will be so indicated. Mutations that are neither LOF nor GOF (e.g., neomorphs and antimorphs) are rarer, and allele-specific superscripts will be retained for them (e.g., *ci*^D [3818] and *en*^I [1636]).

LOF and GOF tests are used to assess the necessity (LOF) and sufficiency (GOF) of a specific gene for a particular process [173, 3643, 4333, 4671], and they are valuable tools. However, neither is foolproof. For example, if we delete gene “*a*” and see no effect on bristles (a negative LOF result), then *a* is clearly dispensable for bristle formation, but we cannot conclude that *a* is irrelevant because it might be acting redundantly with gene “*b*” [2845, 4584]: “*a* or *b* \rightarrow bristle.” GOF data can also be misleading [6, 682, 1329]. For instance, if we drive the expression of gene “*a*” in a region where it is not normally transcribed and find that it induces bristles (a positive GOF result), then *a* is clearly sufficient for evoking bristles [1458, 1854, 2019, 3267], but this does not mean that *a* promotes bristle formation in *wild-type flies* because GOF perturbations can saturate limiting components (e.g., bHLH

partners [438, 918, 1854] or external ligands [421]) or provoke interactions with other pathways (e.g., converging RTK cascades [326, 1117, 2623] or branched Frizzled chains [3912, 4365, 4867]), resulting in all sorts of artifacts [6]. Researchers beware!

It is... unsafe to deduce normal gene function [when] the product is forced into inappropriate cells, perhaps in the absence of proteins with which it normally interacts and the presence of others that it does not normally encounter. [1304]

Results derived from mutant analyses or from utilizing ectopic expression of a gene product reveal the potential of a particular interaction to occur, not whether the interaction actually occurs during wild-type development. [3248]

Artifacts can be minimized by combining LOF and GOF tests [147, 3462]. Indeed, that is the only way to distinguish factors that are “instructive” for cell fates from those that are merely “permissive.” Instructive agents have both LOF and GOF effects, whereas permissive agents have a LOF but no GOF effect [449, 1455]. Even this 2-pronged approach may not be able to resolve epistatic relations, however, where (1) interactions are co-operative as in multiprotein complexes, (2) pathways are nonlinear, (3) feedback obscures causality, or (4) the “upstream” vs. “downstream” ranking of genes contradicts the order of cellular actions in time. An example of the last difficulty involves *scute* and *Notch*. In general, *scute* is epistatic to *Notch* (i.e., *scute*^{LOF} *Notch*^{LOF} flies show the *scute*^{LOF} missing-bristle trait instead of the *Notch*^{LOF} extra-bristle trait) [918, 1797, 1802, 3270, 3983], so *scute* should be acting downstream of *Notch*, but in fact *scute* must endow cells with “proneural competence” before *Notch* can enforce any “lateral inhibition” (cf. Ch. 3). The situation is even more complex at certain sites where *Notch* also acts before *scute* during a “prepattern” (pre-proneural) stage [461, 886].

Not all the fly’s circuitry is as inscrutable as the *Notch-scute-Notch* cascade, but our view of every subsystem is distorted by the imperfect lens of genetic dissection [2917, 3881, 4085, 4671]. Conclusions must therefore be qualified by layers of caveats about this or that alternative interpretation. The problem with such equivocation, of course, is that it can put readers to sleep.

How much of this blather can readers tolerate? Why not just present “best guess” models and avoid all the dithering? Good advice on this issue comes from a delightful little essay entitled, “Wingless signaling: The inconvenient complexities of life.” Therein, Rachel Cox and Mark Peifer argue that cartoon-like abstractions are essential but must be tempered by critiques that convey

the subtleties. Around every “gospel truth” there is a Talmudic aura of uncertainty. The author’s goal should be to make the material as accessible as possible without hiding any ambiguities. This book will attempt to do just that.

Nature is a home handywoman. Constrained by evolution, she does the job with the tools at hand, using a screwdriver for a hammer if necessary.... This machinery is neither elegant nor simple, but consists rather of a complex set of interacting proteins that were cobbled together by evolution.... Models help to organize our thoughts and offer testable hypotheses. Of course, in constructing a model, some data may need to be hammered into place, and the inconvenient data that cannot be coaxed into place have to be left out. The models that are frequently illustrated in minireviews... thus cannot be viewed as the “truth,” or they would narrow thought processes and squelch novel lines of research. We must be thoughtful iconoclasts, remembering that ultimately all models are wrong, fundamentally flawed or lacking the full complexity of systems shaped by evolution rather than intelligent design. We will thus use this forum to critique rather than prop up our model. It is increasingly clear that life is more complicated than portrayed there. [894]

Only by venturing into the ocean of literature can novices experience the richer Fly World beyond the Internet harbors. Alas, it is all too easy to get lost in those rougher seas. For that reason, an effort is made to supply the equivalents of charts and buoys. To wit, all key mysteries that have taunted investigators are set in boldface when introduced. So are the models and metaphors that have been contrived to explain the mysteries, plus the epiphanies encountered whenever great mysteries were slain. All these concepts are inventoried in Appendix 2. Some of the coined names for the concepts are whimsical, but no more so than the silly names of many fly genes. Indeed, working in this field has been so much fun *because* of its playful irreverence – a legacy of the neophyte pioneers in Morgan’s team [119]. Even “the Boss” himself loved to clash ideas [2947] and smash idols [2946]. Ideas are contrasted here wherever possible, and the style is decidedly iconoclastic.

All statements are source-referenced, and cross-references that are not direct attributions are listed as “cf. such-and-such” – a style that is common in the humanities but rare in the sciences [1630]. The cf.’s mean to compare, confer, or just “see also.” Due to space limitations, some citation strings had to be truncated. Those cases are flagged with a “Δ” superscript to alert readers who want to trace earlier sources thereby. An unabridged bibliography is posted at *The Interactive Fly*.

PREFACE

xv

Esoterica are banished to tables, figures, and appendices wherever possible, and supportive evidence is crammed into indented blocks of text so that readers can skip them if they want. Even so, readers may find some sections of the text unnavigable without looking up the cited papers and tracing their lines of reasoning. Subheadings are worded as sentences so that the Table of Contents reads like a summary for each chapter. Gene abbreviations are defined wherever they are used in the text. Overall, the layout is designed to avoid boring the expert without confusing the novice. I still remember how hard it was to make my way into this field as an apprehensive apprentice.

This field has seen paradigm clashes of Promethean proportions, and those wars must be recounted to do the subject justice. For that reason, the modern facts have been woven into a historical tapestry, with a few homilies stitched in for good measure. Admitting past mistakes can help in spotting future pitfalls... even in the Olympian realm of molecular genetics, which surprisingly has more than a fair share of mortal foibles [1879, 2414, 3909, 4669, 4673]. The potential pitfalls include not only (1) the aforementioned LOF and GOF artifacts, but also (2) reporter anomalies (e.g., perdurance of β -gal [3764, 4188]), (3) antibody limitations (e.g., misleading epitopes on proteins that are cleaved [155, 3271] or reshaped [1980]), (4) confocal illusions [3293, 4760], and (5) *in vitro* infidelities relative to *in vivo* conditions [655, 871]. For the next generation of researchers, some of the parables may sound quaint, but for those of us who toiled through this period, they are a chronicle worth preserving.

Readers accustomed to color photos may bemoan the book's reliance on black-and-white diagrams. I am sorry for any disappointment. The latter style just seemed more fitting for an abstract analysis. All the figures were drawn in ADOBE *Illustrator* by me (a hopeless attempt to compete with my truly artistic siblings). They evolved from cartoons into montages. When many grew too big to fit the standard 6 × 9-in. size of this series, I tried breaking them into pieces but found that the surgery was lethal. The montages had acquired a life of their own. They tell whole stories (some of which spill over into App. 7). I thank Cambridge for approving a

larger trim size and for letting me set my own deadline. The cusp of the millennium seemed an apt time to step back and take a wide-angle “snapshot” of this blossoming field. The last batch of citations came from the annual *Drosophila* Research Conference (in Washington, DC) entitled, “2001: A Fly Odyssey.”

This project began in 1992 when Robin Smith (then Life Sciences Editor at Cambridge) asked me to write a book for this series at the behest of Paul Green (a series editor). The topic took shape gradually, and the contract was signed in 1996. By 1997, my other professional pursuits had to be sidelined as the writing became all-consuming. I thank Peter Barlow (another series editor) for calming my fears and Ellen Carlin (Assistant Life Sciences Editor) for trusting my judgment.

Encouragement was provided by my dear parents (Maj. Gen. Lewis I. Held and Minnie Cansino Held), siblings (Lloyd, a.k.a Grey, and Linda), other relatives and sundry friends – most of whom remain skeptical that any sane adult can adore flies. Maybe this book will change their minds? Probably not!

Critical comments on portions of the manuscript were kindly furnished by Seth Blair, Tom Brody, Ian Duncan, Matt Gibson, Robert Holmgren, Teresa Orenic, Grace Panganiban, Amy Ralston, Allen Shearn, David Sutherland, and Tanya Wolff. The idea about Notch and Argos in the Skeptic-Theorist debate (Ch. 6) was Seth's. I regret any overlooked errors.

As one foot soldier in the global army of fly pushers, I have met many “generals” over the years who figure prominently in this saga. By far the greatest – and humblest – was Curt Stern. His musings on the mysteries of patterning were the siren songs that lured me to this lovely fly. Those of us who heeded his call have long dreamt of finding insights one day. Little did any of us suspect, though, that the bounty of revelations in the last decade would go so far beyond merely sating our curiosity. As we sift the treasure, the sparkle of so many answers is fostering – even in the saltiest among us – a profound sense of awe.

Lewis I. Held, Jr.
 Lubbock, Texas
 April 2001