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Given sets $A$ and $B$, their symmetric difference is

$$
\begin{align*}
A \Delta B & =(A \backslash B) \cup(B \backslash A)  \tag{1}\\
& =(A \cup B) \backslash(A \cap B) \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Because (1) (and (2)) is symmetric in $A$ and $B$, we immediately find that $\Delta$ is commutative. That is, $A \Delta B=B \Delta A$. The purpose of this note is to prove the following less obvious property of the $\Delta$ operation.

Proposition 1. The symmetric difference is associative. That is, given sets $A, B$ and $C$, one has

$$
(A \Delta B) \Delta C=A \Delta(B \Delta C)
$$

This proposition is an almost immediate consequence of the characterization of $(A \Delta B) \Delta C$ given below.
Lemma 1. Let $A, B$ and $C$ be sets. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
(A \Delta B) \Delta C=((A \cup B \cup C) \backslash[(A \cap B) \cup(A \cap C) \cup(B \cap C)]) \cup(A \cap B \cap C) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

To see how the proposition follows from the lemma, note that the right hand side of (3) is invariant under permutation of $A, B$ and $C$. Thus

$$
(A \Delta B) \Delta C=(B \Delta C) \Delta A=A \Delta(B \Delta C)
$$

where we have used the commutativity of $\Delta$ to obtain the final equality. So all we need to do now is prove the lemma.

Proof of Lemma 1. By (1), (2) and the distributive laws for $\wedge$ and $\vee$ we have ${ }^{1}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x \in(A \Delta B) \Delta C \\
& \cong(x \in A \Delta B \wedge x \notin C) \vee(x \notin A \Delta B \wedge x \in C) \\
& \cong([(x \in A \wedge x \notin B) \vee(x \notin A \wedge x \in B)] \wedge x \notin C) \vee([x \notin A \cup B \vee x \in A \cap B] \wedge x \in C) \\
& \cong[x \in A \wedge x \notin B \wedge x \notin C] \vee[x \notin A \wedge x \in B \wedge x \notin C] \vee[x \notin A \cup B \wedge x \in C] \vee[x \in A \cap B \wedge x \in C] \\
& \cong[x \in A \wedge x \notin B \wedge x \notin C] \vee[x \notin A \wedge x \in B \wedge x \notin C] \vee[x \notin A \wedge x \notin B \wedge x \in C] \vee[x \in A \cap B \cap C] \\
& \cong[x \in A \wedge x \notin B \cup C] \vee[x \in B \wedge x \notin A \cup C] \vee[x \in C \wedge x \notin A \cup B] \vee[x \in A \cap B \cap C]
\end{aligned}
$$

For arbitrary statements $P$ and $Q$, notice that

$$
(P \vee Q) \wedge \neg Q \cong(P \wedge \neg Q) \vee(Q \wedge \neg Q) \cong P \wedge \neg Q
$$

[^0]since $Q \wedge \neg Q$ is a contradiction. Taking $P=(x \in A)$ and $Q=(x \in B \cup C)$, this implies
$$
x \in A \wedge x \notin B \cup C \cong(x \in A \vee x \in B \cup C) \wedge x \notin B \cup C \cong x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin B \cup C .
$$

Similarly we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x \in B \wedge x \notin A \cup C \cong x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin A \cup C \\
& x \in C \wedge x \notin A \cup B \cong x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin A \cup B
\end{aligned}
$$

So our computation of $x \in(A \Delta B) \Delta C$ continues with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \cong[x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin B \cup C] \vee[x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin A \cup C] \vee[x \in A \cup B \cup C \wedge x \notin A \cup B] \\
& \cong([x \in A \cup B \cup C] \wedge[x \notin B \cup C \vee x \notin A \cup C \vee x \notin A \cup B]) \vee[x \in A \cap B \cap C] \\
& \cong([x \in A \cup B \cup C] \wedge[x \notin(B \cup C) \cap(A \cup C) \cap(A \cup B)]) \vee[x \in A \cap B \cap C] \\
& \cong x \in((A \cup B \cup C) \backslash[(A \cup B) \cap(A \cup C) \cap(B \cup C)]) \cup(A \cap B \cap C)
\end{aligned}
$$

The result now follows from the fact that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(A \cup B) \cap(A \cup C) \cap(B \cup C) & =[A \cup(B \cap C)] \cap(B \cup C) \\
& =[A \cap(B \cup C)] \cup[(B \cap C) \cap(B \cup C)] \\
& =(A \cap B) \cup(A \cap C) \cup(B \cap C)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the final line we have used the fact that $(B \cap C) \cap(B \cup C)=B \cap C$ since $B \cap C \subset B \cup C$.

## Appendix

A simpler but more sophisticated proof can be given using characteristic functions of sets. Given a set $A$, its characteristic function $\chi_{A}$ is defined by

$$
\chi_{A}(x)= \begin{cases}1, & \text { if } x \in A \\ 0, & \text { if } x \notin A\end{cases}
$$

Therefore $A=B$ if and only if $\chi_{A}=\chi_{B}$. Multiplication and addition of characteristic functions correspond to certain set operations. Specifically, $\chi_{A} \chi_{B}=\chi_{A \cap B}$ and, provided we add modulo 2 (i.e. we assert that 1 $+1=0), \chi_{A}+\chi_{B}=\chi_{A \Delta B}$. Because addition modulo 2 is associative, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\chi_{(A \Delta B) \Delta C} & =\chi_{A \Delta B}+\chi_{C} \\
& =\left(\chi_{A}+\chi_{B}\right)+\chi_{C} \\
& =\chi_{A}+\left(\chi_{B}+\chi_{C}\right) \\
& =\chi_{A}+\chi_{B \Delta C} \\
& =\chi_{A \Delta(B \Delta C)},
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence $(A \Delta B) \Delta C=A \Delta(B \Delta C)$.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Because it is symmetric in $A, B$ and $C$, the final statement in this chain of equivalences is sufficient to prove Proposition 1. It needs to be manipulated further, however, to prove Lemma 1.

