

$2(2d+1)$  is not a  $k$ th power residue modulo  $p$ . Since  $n$  was arbitrary then  $\Lambda(k, 4) = \infty$ . This proves the theorem.

## REFERENCES

1. E. Kummer, Abh. K. Akad. Wiss. Berlin (1859).
2. D. H. and E. Lehmer, *On runs of residues*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (1962), 102-106.
3. W. H. Mills, *Characters with preassigned values*, Canad. J. Math. **15** (1963), 169-171.

BELL TELEPHONE LABORATORIES

---

 ON DECOMPOSITIONS OF PARTIALLY ORDERED SETS

E. S. WOLK

**1. Introduction.** Let  $P$  be a set which is partially ordered by a relation  $\leq$ . A *decomposition*  $\mathfrak{D}$  of  $P$  is a family of mutually disjoint non-empty chains in  $P$  such that  $P = \cup \{C : C \in \mathfrak{D}\}$ . Two elements  $x, y$  of  $P$  are *incomparable* if and only if  $x \not\leq y$  and  $y \not\leq x$ . A *totally unordered* set in  $P$  is a subset in which every two different elements are incomparable. We denote the cardinal number of a set  $S$  by  $|S|$ .

Dilworth [1] has proved the following well-known decomposition theorem.

**THEOREM 1 (DILWORTH).** *Let  $P$  be a partially ordered set, and suppose that  $n$  is a positive integer such that*

$$n = \max \{ |A| : A \text{ is a totally unordered subset of } P \}.$$

*Then there is a decomposition  $\mathfrak{D}$  of  $P$  with  $|\mathfrak{D}| = n$ .*

It is natural to ask whether, in this theorem, the positive integer  $n$  may be replaced by an infinite cardinal number. However, the theorem is no longer valid in this case, as is shown by an example in [3] which is due in essence of Sierpinski [2]. In this example  $P$  is a set of pairs which represents a 1-1 mapping from  $\omega_1$ , the first uncountable ordinal, into the real numbers.  $(x_1, y_1) \leq (x_2, y_2)$  is defined by:  $x_1 \leq x_2$  (as ordinals) and  $y_1 \leq y_2$  (as real numbers). The purpose of this note is to show that a similar idea leads, given any infinite cardinal  $k$ , to

---

Received by the editors December 28, 1962.

a construction of a partially ordered set in which all totally unordered subsets are finite but every decomposition is of power  $k$ . We also give an application of this result to the theory of graphs.

In the following we identify cardinals with initial ordinals. If  $C$  is any chain and  $B \subseteq C$ , we shall say that  $B$  is *cofinal* in  $C$  if and only if for each  $x \in C$  there exists  $y \in B$  with  $x \leq y$ .

**2. Main result.**

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $k$  be any infinite cardinal. Let  $Q(k) = k \times k$ , and let a partial ordering on  $Q(k)$  be defined by:  $(x_1, y_1) \leq (x_2, y_2)$  if and only if  $x_1 \leq x_2$  and  $y_1 \leq y_2$ . Then*

- (i) every totally unordered subset of  $Q(k)$  is finite, and
- (ii) every decomposition of  $Q(k)$  is of power  $k$ .

**PROOF.** (i) If  $x_1 = x_2$ , then  $(x_1, y_1)$  and  $(x_2, y_2)$  are not incomparable. Hence in a totally unordered subset of  $Q(k)$  first coordinates of different members are different; they are also well ordered by  $\leq$ . Therefore, if there is an infinite totally unordered subset it would include a sequence  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n), \dots$  in which  $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_n < x_{n+1} < \dots$ . If  $y_n \leq y_{n+1}$  we would have  $(x_n, y_n) \leq (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})$ , and hence  $y_1 > y_2 > \dots > y_n > y_{n+1} > \dots$ ; but this is impossible as the  $y_n$ 's are well ordered by  $\leq$ .

(ii) Since  $|Q(k)| = k$  every decomposition of  $Q(k)$  is of power  $\leq k$ . Hence it suffices to show that every decomposition is of power  $\geq k$ . First assume that  $k$  is regular. For  $v < k$ , let us define  $L_v = k \times \{v\} = \{(a, v) : a < k\}$ . If  $C$  is a chain in  $Q(k)$  such that  $C$  is cofinal in  $L_v$  and  $v < v'$ , then  $C \cap L_{v'} = \emptyset$ . For if  $(a, v') \in C$ , then there is an  $a'$  such that  $a' > a$  and  $(a', v) \in C$ , but  $(a, v)$  and  $(a', v)$  are incomparable. In particular, no chain is cofinal in both  $L_v$  and  $L_{v'}$  if  $v \neq v'$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{D}$  be any decomposition of  $Q(k)$ . If for every  $v < k$  there is a  $C$  in  $\mathfrak{D}$  such that  $C$  is cofinal in  $L_v$ , then it follows by the observation just made that  $|\mathfrak{D}| \geq k$ . If on the other hand there is a  $v$  such that no  $C$  in  $\mathfrak{D}$  is cofinal in  $L_v$ , it follows from the regularity of  $k$  and from the fact that  $\cup \{C : C \in \mathfrak{D}\} \supseteq L_v$ , that  $|\mathfrak{D}| \geq k$ .

Now if  $k$  is any infinite cardinal and  $\mathfrak{D}$  is a decomposition of  $Q(k)$ , then  $\{C \cap Q(h) : C \in \mathfrak{D}\}$  is a decomposition of  $Q(h)$  for every cardinal  $h \leq k$ . Hence, for every regular cardinal  $h$  which is  $\leq k$ , we have  $|\mathfrak{D}| \geq h$ , and therefore  $|\mathfrak{D}| \geq k$ . This completes the proof.

**3. An application to graph theory.** Let  $G$  be a set, and let  $G^2$  denote the set of all two-element subsets of  $G$ . By a *graph* we mean a pair  $(G, R)$ , where  $G$  is a set and  $R \subseteq G^2$ . If the unordered pair  $\{x, y\}$  is an element of  $R$ , we write  $xRy$ : if this is not the case, we write  $x\bar{R}y$ .

A subset  $H$  of  $G$  is *complete* if and only if  $xRy$  for all  $x \in H, y \in H$ . A subset  $H$  of  $G$  is *independent* if and only if  $x \bar{R}y$  for all  $x \in H, y \in H$ . A *decomposition* of a graph  $(G, R)$  is a family of mutually disjoint nonempty independent subsets of  $G$  whose union is  $G$ . For any graph  $(G, R)$ , we define

$$d(G) = \text{l.u.b.} \{ |H| : H \text{ is a complete subset of } G \},$$

$$c(G) = \min \{ |\mathfrak{D}| : \mathfrak{D} \text{ is a decomposition of } (G, R) \}.$$

It is clear that  $d(G) \leq c(G)$  for all graphs  $(G, R)$ .

Zykov [4, Theorem 8] has shown that, given any positive integers  $d_0$  and  $c_0$  with  $d_0 \leq c_0$ , there is a graph  $(G, R)$  such that  $d(G) = d_0$  and  $c(G) = c_0$ . Using Theorem 2, we now show that this result may be extended to infinite cardinals. We shall prove

**THEOREM 3.** *Given any infinite cardinal numbers  $k$  and  $m$  with  $k \leq m$ , there exists a graph  $(G, R)$  such that  $d(G) = k$  and  $c(G) = m$ .*

**PROOF.** Let  $P$  be any partially ordered set. If  $x, y \in P$ , define  $xRy$  if and only if  $x$  and  $y$  are incomparable with respect to the partial order in  $P$ . We call the graph  $(P, R)$  the *incomparability graph* of the partially ordered set  $P$ .

Now, given the cardinal numbers  $k$  and  $m$ , assume first that  $k = \aleph_0$ . Then the incomparability graph of the partially ordered set  $Q(m)$  satisfies the required conditions. If  $k > \aleph_0$ , we adjoin to  $Q(m)$  a set  $A$  of mutually incomparable elements with  $|A| = k$ . We define  $r \leq s$  for all  $r \in A$  and  $s \in Q(m)$ , and we retain the previously defined partial order within  $Q(m)$ . The reader may now verify that the incomparability graph of the partially ordered set  $A \cup Q(m)$  satisfies the requirements of the theorem.

#### REFERENCES

1. R. P. Dilworth, *A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets*, Ann. of Math. (2) **51** (1950), 161-166.
2. W. Sierpinski, *Sur un problème de la théorie des relations*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa **2** (1933), 285-287.
3. E. S. Wolk, *The comparability graph of a tree*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (1962), 789-795.
4. A. A. Zykov, *On some properties of linear complexes*, Amer. Math. Soc. Transl. no. 79, 1952.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT