and colour schemes, anoles of the Greater Antilles seem to have settled on a handful of 'ecomorphs', which have parallels on the different islands. This is remarkable because it is believed that the ecomorphs are convergent between islands[6]. Thus, for example, the 'tree trunk-and-crown' ecomorph on Puerto Rico is more closely related to other ecologically dissimilar ecomorphs on Puerto Rico, than it is to the trunk-and-crown anoles on Jamaica or Hispaniola. In this way there is a crude 'periodic table' of types of anole in the Greater Antilles. To be sure, some odd-ball, 'rare-element' species exist, particularly on the large islands of Cuba and Hispaniola, but students of this group have been struck more by the one-by-one species convergences than the occasional departures from the normal ecomorph series.

This story took an exciting turn in the past few years as more detailed phylogenetic analyses, stemming in part from studies on different enzyme forms and on chromosomes, allowed inferences to be made as to the historical build-up of the ecomorph series on Jamaica and Puerto Rico. Not only do these islands share a similar suite of ecomorphs, but the inferred evolutionary build-up of ecomorphs has apparently followed similar trajectories[8,10]. Clearly, it would be nice to verify these events with a phylogenetic reconstruction based on DNA sequence data.

One outstanding question about the rapid morphological changes in the experimental *A. sagrei* populations is whether those changes are genetic in origin. Anoles are not ideal laboratory animals for genetic studies, and there is a singular lack of reports of the heritabilities of the relevant morphological characters (although there have been studies of a few other lizards and several of snakes). Common experience teaches us that exercise alone can influence bone and muscle growth (witness the couch potato). Yet, even assuming that differentiation might initially represent a purely phenotypic response to altered 'exercise' conditions, it would be surprising indeed if natural selection did not later reinforce these tendencies — phenotypic plasticity typically has a genetic basis[11,12] and the changes are clearly adaptive.

The morphological rate of change for lizards on these small islands ranged from 0 to 2,117 darwins (a darwin is the change in the mean of the natural log of the characteristic concerned divided by elapsed time in millions of years; the log transformation scales the phenotypic change to remove a potential bias that favours larger absolute changes for larger phenotypic characters). A rate of 2,000 darwins is several orders of magnitude higher than that seen in the fossil record[13]. Reznick *et al.*[14] have, however, reported even higher rates (3,700 to 45,000 darwins) for some life-history characters of guppies. In these experiments, guppies from high-predation parts of streams in Trinidad were introduced into upstream areas which larger fish predators could not reach. Over 11 years these guppies evolved a later reproductive maturity which occurred at larger body sizes. Given a trade-off between investing resources into adult survival or reproducing, in the former circumstances the selective scales are tipped towards earlier reproduction, because an adult's chance of surviving is severely limited by predators.

The rapid and clear-cut within-species adaptive differentiation of anole populations on tiny islands mirrors in miniature some elements of the larger-scale, across-species adaptive radiations seen in *Anolis* in the Greater Antilles. Yet if significant changes in morphology emerge after only a decade, why do we not see *A. sagrei* 'radiating' even more across the hundreds of islands in the Bahamas where it has been present for probably thousands of years? Populations of *A. sagrei* on different islands have differentiated adaptively: those using broader perches have longer hindlimbs[9]. Still, an *A. sagrei* seems to be an *A. sagrei* throughout the islands, though it may differ a bit in hindlimb length. Perhaps the next major leap in adaptive radiations requires the presence of related species to help force divergence. The Bahamas has several anoles, although none is endemic. So this ingredient seems to exist, but perhaps these other species are already too different from *A. sagrei* to provide a competitive catalyst for further change. Given the rapid and convincing response reported by Losos *et al.*, it may well be feasible to devise experiments to test interspecific competition as an additional selective force. But the virtue of patience will again be required. □

Ted J. Case is in the Department of Biology, 0116, University of California at San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, California 92093-0116, USA.

1. Cody, M. L. & Overton, J. *J. Ecol.* **84,** 53–62 (1996).
2. Losos, J. B., Warheit, K. I. & Schoener, T. W. *Nature* **387,** 70–73 (1997).
3. Wilson, L. D. & Porras, L. *Univ. Kansas Mus. Nat. Hist. Spec. Publ.* No. 9 (1983).
4. Salzburg, M. A. *Ecology* **65,** 14–19 (1984).
5. Schoener, T. W. & Schoener, A. *Nature* **302,** 332–334 (1983).
6. Williams, E. E. in *Lizard Ecology: Studies of a Model Organism* (eds Huey, R. B., Pianka, E. R. & Schoener, T. W.) 326–370 (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1983).
7. Losos, J. B. & Sinervo, B. *J. Exp. Biol.* **145,** 23–30 (1989).
8. Losos, J. B. *Syst. Biol.* **41,** 403–420 (1992).
9. Losos, J. B., Irschick, D. J. & Shoener, T. W. *Evolution* **48,** 1786–1798 (1994).
10. Losos, J. B. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* **349,** 69–73 (1995).
11. Waddington, C. H. *The Strategy of the Genes* (Allen & Unwin, London, 1957).
12. West-Eberhard, M. J. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **20,** 249–278 (1989).
13. Gingerich, P. D. *Science* **222,** 159–161 (1983).
14. Reznick, D. N., Shaw, F. H., Rodd, F. H. & Shaw, R. G. *Science* **275,** 1934–1937 (1997).

Transcriptional control

Sinful repression

Alan P. Wolffe

The structure of chromatin — the material of which eukaryotic chromosomes are composed — presents both problems and opportunities to the transcriptional machinery. Genes are transcribed in the eukaryotic nucleus without apparent impediment, even though the DNA template is wrapped around histone proteins to form nucleosomes and the chromatin fibre. Evolution has been remarkably successful in shaping chromatin such that it can become alternatively transparent or opaque, to facilitate or restrict the access of transcription factors and RNA polymerase to DNA. The molecular mechanisms that control this access are central to gene regulation, and two reports, by Heinzel *et al.*[1] and Alland *et al.*[2] on pages 43 and 49 of this issue respectively, along with five related papers in *Cell*, complete one picture of how gene regulation is controlled.

Nucleosomes are not static entities — they adopt a variety of stability states that are dependent on post-translational modification of the core histones. In particular, acetylation of the histones can destabilize nucleosomes and relieve transcriptional repression by allowing transcription factors access to recognition elements. Conversely, deacetylation of the histones stabilizes the repressed state[3]. Last year, certain transcriptional co-activators were found to have histone acetyltransferase activity. So specific targeting of these regulatory complexes could allow nucleosome modification to be directed to particular promoters[4,5].

The CREB-binding protein (p300/CBP) is one such co-activator. It has histone acetyltransferase activity, integrating transcriptional-activation signals from diverse regulatory proteins, including steroid and nuclear-hormone receptors[6]. Histone acetylation is targeted by these receptors in response to the addition of ligand (for example, oestrogen and thyroid hormone), rendering the chromatin much more transparent to the transcriptional machinery. Heinzel *et al.*[1] and Alland *et al.*[2] now show that histone deacetylation might also be targeted by nuclear-hormone receptors and other transcriptional repressors. The five papers in *Cell* substantiate these observations, and extend the repertoire of proven and potential regulatory proteins that use similar repression mechanisms[7–11]. The emerging picture is one of gene regulation in which reversible alterations in histone chemistry have an important controlling function.



Figure 1 **The findings by Heinzel *et al.*[1] and Alland *et al.*[2] contribute to a three-step model for transcriptional regulation by the thyroid-hormone receptor.** a, **Precise rotational positioning of the DNA sequence containing the thyroid-hormone response element (TRE) on the surface of the histone octamer, allows the thyroid-hormone receptor (TR/RXR) access to chromatin[14].** b, **Once in place, the unliganded receptor recruits a deacetylase complex (mRPD3/Sin3/N-CoR) to augment repression[1,2].** c, **Subsequent addition of thyroid hormone (TH) leads to recruitment of acetyltransferases (p300/CBP, P/CAF, TAF$_{II}$250) that can disrupt these repressive histone–DNA interactions[5,6,17].**

Heinzel *et al.*[1] report that N-CoR, a known co-repressor for the thyroid-hormone receptor, exists in a complex with the mammalian homologues of two yeast co-repressors, Sin3 and RPD3. Sin3 and RPD3 both act in a pathway that accentuates the transcriptional silencing of several yeast genes[12], and RPD3 is a histone deacetylase[13]. The authors have done antibody-blocking experiments in microinjected mammalian cells to show that each component of the N-CoR/mSin3/mRPD3 complex is essential for the transcriptional repression that is directed by the unliganded thyroid-hormone receptor. Moreover, this transcriptional repression is greatly potentiated by nucleosome assembly[14], in agreement with the prediction that the targeted co-repressor will need a nucleosomal template with which to function most effectively through the action of histone deacetylase.

Mammalian Sin3 is also a co-repressor for the Mad/Max complex[15]. Mad is a sequence-specific DNA-binding helix–loop–helix protein that antagonizes the transcriptional activation and transformation functions of the oncoprotein Myc. Mad acts, in part, by competing with Myc for a common heterodimeric partner, Max. Alland *et al.*[2] show that mSin3 uses distinct domains to interact with Mad, N-CoR and the mammalian histone deacetylase (mRPD3). This modular series of interactions allows discrimination between the diverse functions of mSin3. Mammalian Sin3 contains four paired, amphipathic helices (PAH1–4). N-CoR associates with PAH1, the Mad–mSin3 association requires PAH2, and mRPD3 associates with the PAH3 and PAH4 domains[2,15]. Transcriptional repression by Mad requires only PAH1 and PAH2, whereas suppression of transformation requires PAH3 and PAH4 (ref. 2). Histone deacetylase is only recovered in the co-repressor complex that contains all four helices, suggesting that N-CoR bound to PAH1–2 might use other mechanisms — in addition to histone deacetylation — to repress transcription. In contrast, the tumour-suppression properties of mSin3 require the full-length protein and associated histone deacetylase. This is particularly interesting because acute myelocytic leukaemia is associated with a chromosomal translocation that fuses the zinc-finger DNA-binding domain of the *MOZ* (monocytic-leukaemia zinc-finger) gene to the histone acetyltransferase CBP (ref. 16). Deregulated histone acetylation might promote transformation, and the regulated activity of histone deacetylase might contribute to growth control.

By defining transcriptional repressors as histone deacetylases and transcriptional activators as histone acetyltransferases, the histones and chromatin structure are fully integrated as necessary components of the regulatory machinery. Although the exact biochemical mechanisms are not yet known, a three-step mechanism can now be proposed for transcriptional regulation by the thyroid-hormone receptor (Fig. 1). Normal chromatin has a constitutive level of histone acetylation that allows basal transcription; but, in the absence of thyroid hormone (TH), the thyroid-hormone receptor (TR/RXR) binds to nucleosomal DNA and targets histone deacetylation, thereby repressing transcription. In the presence of thyroid hormone, histone acetyltransferases are recruited to relieve the transcriptional repression.

Targeted acetylation allows the basal machinery to displace nucleosomes, assemble a functional transcription complex and never have to deal with chromatin again. Alternatively, the regulated association and activity of histone acetyltransferases and deacetylases might occur within a common complex. Transcriptional activity could then be continually modulated through variation in the conformation of the chromatin. Histones would remain present throughout the transcription process. Recapitulating these events means that we will have to understand the regulation of an increasingly sophisticated machinery, and an enzymology that is dedicated to communication between the proteins that package DNA and those that use it as a template. □

Alan P. Wolffe is in the Laboratory of Molecular Embryology, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, NIH Building 18T, Bethesda, Maryland 20892-5431, USA.

1. Heinzel, T. *et al. Nature* **387,** 43–48 (1997).
2. Alland, L. *et al. Nature* **387,** 49–55 (1997).
3. Ura, K., Kurumizaka, H., Dimitrov, S., Almouzni, G. & Wolffe, A. P. *EMBO J.* (in the press).
4. Brownell, J. E. *et al. Cell* **84,** 843–851 (1996).
5. Yang, X. J., Ogryzko, V. V., Nishikama, J. I., Howard, B. & Nakatani, Y. *Nature* **382,** 319–324 (1996).
6. Ogryzko, V. V., Schiltz, R. L., Russanova, V., Howard, B. & Nakatani, Y. *Cell* **87,** 953–959 (1996).
7. Hassig, C. A., Fleischer, T. C., Billin, A. N., Schreiber, S. L. & Ayer, D. E. *Cell* **89,** 341–347 (1997).
8. Laherty, C. D. *et al. Cell* **89,** 349–356 (1997).
9. Zhang, Y., Iratnl, R., Erdjument-Bromage, H., Tempst, P. & Reinberg, D. *Cell* **89,** 357–364 (1997).
10. Kadosh, D. & Struhl, K. *Cell* **89,** 365–371 (1997).
11. Nagy, L. *et al. Cell* **89,** 373–380 (1997).
12. Vidal, M. & Gaber, R. F. *Mol. Cell Biol.* **11,** 6317–6327 (1991).
13. Taunton, J., Hassig, C. A. & Schreiber, S. L. *Science* **272,** 408–411 (1996).
14. Wong, J., Shi, Y.-B. & Wolffe, A. P. *Genes Dev.* **9,** 2691–2711 (1995).
15. Ayer, D. E., Lawrence, Q. A. & Eisenman, R. N. *Cell* **80,** 767–776 (1995).
16. Borrow, J. *et al. Nature Genet.* **14,** 33–41 (1996).
17. Wong, J., Shi, Y.-B. & Wolffe, A. P. *EMBO J.* (in the press).

© 1997 Nature Publishing Group