

Curry's Paradox in Naproche

Marcel Schütz

2025

Curry's Paradox is a paradox described by Haskell Curry in 1942 [1]. It allows the derivation of an arbitrary statement from a self-referential expression that presupposes its own validity.

Untyped λ -Calculus

Our formalization of Curry's Paradox in Naproche is based on an untyped λ -calculus:

Signature. An *expression* is a notion.

Let E, E' denote expressions.

Signature. A *variable* is an expression.

Signature. x_0 is a variable.

Signature (Abstraction). Let x be a variable. $\lambda x. E$ is an expression.

Signature (Application). $(E)(E')$ is an expression.

Signature (Fixed-point combinator). fix is an expression such that

$$(\text{fix})(E) = (E)((\text{fix})(E))$$

for every expression E .

Propositional Logic

We extend this λ -calculus by a fragment of propositional logic:

Let E, E' denote expressions. Let x denote a variable.

Signature (Implication). $E \rightarrow E'$ is an expression.

Signature (Truth). E is *true* is a relation.

Axiom (β -reduction). $(\lambda x. x \rightarrow E')(E) = E \rightarrow E'$.

Axiom (Reflexivity). $E \rightarrow E$ is true.

Axiom (Modus Ponens). If E is true and $E \rightarrow E'$ is true then E' is true.

Axiom (Strengthening). If $E \rightarrow (E \rightarrow E')$ is true then $E \rightarrow E'$ is true.

Curry's paradox

Using the fixpoint combinator from above we can formulate a self-referential expression X of the form “If X is true then E is true” for any arbitrary expression E by defining $X = (\text{fix})(\lambda x_0. x_0 \rightarrow E)$. From the existence of such an expression X together with the above axioms we can then derive that any expression E is true.

Theorem (Curry's Paradox). Every expression is true.

Proof. Let E be an expression. Take $N = \lambda x_0. x_0 \rightarrow E$ and $X = (\text{fix})(N)$.

(1) Then $X = (N)(X) = X \rightarrow E$ (by β -reduction).

Hence $X \rightarrow (X \rightarrow E)$ is true (by 1, reflexivity).

(2) Thus $X \rightarrow E$ is true (by strengthening).

(3) Therefore X is true (by 1, 2).

Consequently E is true (by modus ponens, 2, 3). ■

References

- [1] Haskell B. Curry. “The inconsistency of certain formal logics”. In: *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 7.13 (1942), pp. 115–117.

License

© Marcel Schütz (2024–2025). This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons “Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International”](#) (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0) license.