

Theorem (2.2.18e). *Let A , B , and C be sets. $(B - A) \cup (C - A) = (B \cup C) - A$.*

Proof. Let x be an element in $(B - A) \cup (C - A)$. This is the same as saying $x \in [(B \cap \overline{A}) \cup (C \cap \overline{A})]$. By definition, $[(x \in B) \wedge (x \in \overline{A})] \vee [(x \in C) \wedge (x \in \overline{A})]$. By the associative property for logical conjunction, and factoring out the term $(x \in \overline{A})$, we get $[(x \in B) \vee (x \in C)] \wedge (x \in \overline{A})$. This statement is the definition for $(B \cup C) - A$.

Proving the converse case, suppose that x is an element in $(B \cup C) - A$. Note that the expression is equivalent to $(B \cup C) \cap \overline{A}$. Thus we have the following definition, $[(x \in B) \vee (x \in C)] \wedge (x \in \overline{A})$. By logical distribution for conjunction over disjunction $[(x \in B) \wedge (x \in \overline{A})] \vee [(x \in C) \wedge (x \in \overline{A})]$. This statement defines the expression $x \in [(B \cap \overline{A}) \cup (C \cap \overline{A})]$. Which, as argued in the first paragraph, is logically equivalent to $x \in [(B - A) \cup (C - A)]$.

Since $[(B - A) \cup (C - A)] \subseteq [(B \cup C) - A]$ and $[(B \cup C) - A] \subseteq [(B - A) \cup (C - A)]$. It immediately follows from the definition of set equivalence that $(B - A) \cup (C - A) = (B \cup C) - A$. ■