Psamathe: A DSL with Flows for Safe Blockchain Assets

Reed Oei[1], Michael Coblenz[2], and Jonathan Aldrich[3]

[1] University of Illinois, Urbana, IL, USA
reedoei2@illinois.edu
[2] University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
mcoblenz@umd.edu
[3] Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA
jonathan.aldrich@cs.cmu.edu

1 Introduction

Blockchains are increasingly used as platforms for applications called *smart contracts* [14], which automatically manage transactions in an mutually agreed-upon way. Commonly proposed and implemented applications include supply chain management, healthcare, voting, crowdfunding, auctions, and more [9,8,7]. Smart contracts often manage *digital assets*, such as cryptocurrencies, or, depending on the application, bids in an auction, votes in an election, and so on. These contracts cannot be patched after deployment, even if security vulnerabilities are discovered. Some estimates suggest that as many as 46% of smart contracts may have vulnerabilities [10].

Psamathe (/sɑmɑθi/) is a new programming language we are designing around *flows*, which are a new abstraction representing an atomic transfer operation. Together with features such as *modifiers*, flows provide a **concise** way to write contracts that **safely** manage assets (see Section 2). Solidity, the most commonly-used smart contract language on the Ethereum blockchain [1], does not provide analogous support for assets. A formalization of Psamathe is in progress [2], with an *executable semantics* implemented in the $\mathbb{K}$-framework [11], which is already capable of running the example shown in Figure 1. An extended version [**?**] of this work explains the language in more detail, and shows more examples, such as a voting contract, showing the advantages we describe below.

Other newly-proposed blockchain languages include Flint, Move, Nomos, Obsidian, and Scilla [12,4,6,5,13]. Scilla and Move are intermediate-level languages, whereas Psamathe is intended to be a high-level language. Obsidian, Move, Nomos, and Flint use linear or affine types to manage assets; Psamathe uses *type quantities*, which extend linear types to allow a more precise analysis of the flow of values in a program. None of the these languages have flows or provide support for all the modifiers that Psamathe does.

2 Language

A Psamathe program is made of *transformers* and *type declarations*. Transformers contain *flows* describing the how values are transferred between variables.

Type declarations provide a way to name types and to mark values with *modifiers*, such as `asset`. Figure 1 shows a simple contract declaring a type and a transformer, which implements the core of ERC-20's `transfer` function. ERC-20 is a standard providing a bare-bones interface for token contracts managing *fungible* tokens. Fungible tokens are interchangeable (like most currencies), so it is only important how many tokens are owned by an entity, not **which** tokens. An ERC-20 contract manages "bank accounts" for its tokens, keeping track of how many tokens each account has; accounts are identified by addresses.

```
type Token is fungible asset uint256
transformer transfer(balances : any map one address => any Token,
                     dst : one address, amount : any uint256) {
  balances[msg.sender] --[ amount ]-> balances[dst]
}
```

Fig. 1: A Psamathe contract with a simple `transfer` function, which transfers `amount` tokens from the sender's account to the destination account. It is implemented with a single flow, which automatically checks all the preconditions to ensure the transfer is valid. The type quantities (*any* and *one*) can be omitted.

Psamathe is built around flows. Using the more declarative, *flow-based* approach provides the following advantages over imperative state updates:

- **Static safety guarantees**: Each flow is guaranteed to preserve the total amount of assets (except for flows that explicitly consume or allocate assets). The `immutable` modifier prevents values from changing.
- **Dynamic safety guarantees**: Psamathe automatically inserts dynamic checks of a flow's validity; e.g., a flow of money would fail if there is not enough money in the source, or if there is too much in the destination (e.g., due to overflow). The `unique` modifier, which restrict values to never be created more than once, is also checked dynamically.
- **Data-flow tracking**: We hypothesize that flows provide a clearer way of specifying how resources flow in the code itself, which may be less apparent using other approaches, especially in complicated contracts.
- **Error messages**: When a flow fails, the Psamathe runtime provides automatic, descriptive error messages, such as

```
Cannot flow <amount> Token from account[<src>] to account[<dst>]:
  source only has <balance> Token.
```

Flows enable such messages by encoding information into the source code.

We now give examples using modifiers and type quantities to guarantee additional correctness properties in the context of a lottery. The `unique` and `immutable` modifiers ensure users enter the lottery at most once, while `asset` ensures that we do not accidentally lose tickets. We use `consumable` because tickets no longer have any value when the lottery is over.

```
type TicketOwner is unique immutable address
type Ticket is consumable asset { owner : TicketOwner, guess : uint256 }
```

Consider the following code snippet, handling ending the lottery. The lottery cannot end before there is a winning ticket, enforced by the *nonempty* in the *filter* on line 1; note that, as `winners` is *nonempty*, there cannot be a divide-by-zero error. Without line 3, Psamathe would give an error indicating `balance` has type *any* `ether`, not *empty* `ether`—a true error, because in the case that the jackpot cannot be evenly split between the winners, there will be some ether left over.

```
1 var winners : list Ticket <-[ nonempty st ticketWins(winNum, _) ]-- tickets
2 winners --> payEach(jackpot / length(winners), _) // Split jackpot among winners
3 balance --> lotteryOwner.balance
4 tickets --> consume // Lottery is over, destroy losing tickets
```

One could try automatically inserting such dynamic checks in a language like Solidity, but it would often require additional annotations (e.g., *nonempty*). Such a system would essentially reimplement flows, providing some benefits of Psamathe, but not the same static guarantees.

Comparison with ERC-20 in Solidity Figure 2 shows a Solidity implementation of the same function as Figure 1. The sender's balance must be at least as large as `amount`, and the destination's balance must not overflow when it receives the tokens. Psamathe automatically inserts code checking these two conditions, ensuring the checks are not forgotten.

```
1 mapping (address => uint256) balances;
2 function transfer(address dst, uint256 amount) public {
3   require(amount <= balances[msg.sender]);
4   balances[msg.sender] = balances[msg.sender].sub(amount);
5   balances[dst] = balances[dst].add(amount);
6 }
```

Fig. 2: An exercept from a Solidity reference implementation [3] of the `transfer` function. Preconditions are checked manually. We must include the `SafeMath` library (not shown) to use `add` and `sub`, which check for underflow/overflow.

3 Conclusion and Future Work

We have presented the Psamathe language for writing safer smart contracts. Psamathe uses the new flow abstraction, assets, and type quantities to provide its safety guarantees. We have shown an example smart contract in both Psamathe and Solidity, showing that Psamathe is capable of expressing common smart contract functionality in a concise manner, while retaining key safety properties.

In the future, we plan to implement the Psamathe language, and prove its safety properties. We also hope to study the benefits and costs of the language via case studies, performance evaluation, and the application of flows to other domains. Finally, we would also like to conduct a user study to evaluate the usability of the flow abstraction and the design of the language, and to compare it to Solidity, which we hypothesize will show that developers write contracts with fewer asset management errors in Psamathe than in Solidity.

References

1. Ethereum for developers (2020), https://ethereum.org/en/developers/
2. Psamathe (Aug 2020), https://github.com/ReedOei/Psamathe
3. Tokens (Aug 2020), https://github.com/ConsenSys/Tokens
4. Blackshear, S., Cheng, E., Dill, D.L., Gao, V., Maurer, B., Nowacki, T., Pott, A., Qadeer, S., Rain, D.R., Sezer, S., et al.: Move: A language with programmable resources (2019)
5. Coblenz, M., Oei, R., Etzel, T., Koronkevich, P., Baker, M., Bloem, Y., Myers, B.A., Sunshine, J., Aldrich, J.: Obsidian: Typestate and assets for safer blockchain programming (2019)
6. Das, A., Balzer, S., Hoffmann, J., Pfenning, F., Santurkar, I.: Resource-aware session types for digital contracts. arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.06056 (2019)
7. Elsden, C., Manohar, A., Briggs, J., Harding, M., Speed, C., Vines, J.: Making sense of blockchain applications: A typology for hci. In: CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems. pp. 1–14. CHI '18 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3174032, http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3173574.3174032
8. Harvard Business Review: The potential for blockchain to transform electronic health records (2017), https://hbr.org/2017/03/the-potential-for-blockchain-to-transform-electronic-health-records
9. IBM: Blockchain for supply chain (2019), https://www.ibm.com/blockchain/supply-chain/
10. Luu, L., Chu, D.H., Olickel, H., Saxena, P., Hobor, A.: Making smart contracts smarter. In: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security. p. 254–269. CCS '16, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA (2016). https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978309, https://doi.org/10.1145/2976749.2978309
11. Roşu, G., Şerbănuţă, T.F.: An overview of the K semantic framework. Journal of Logic and Algebraic Programming **79**(6), 397–434 (2010). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlap.2010.03.012
12. Schrans, F., Eisenbach, S., Drossopoulou, S.: Writing safe smart contracts in flint. In: Conference Companion of the 2nd International Conference on Art, Science, and Engineering of Programming. pp. 218–219 (2018)
13. Sergey, I., Nagaraj, V., Johannsen, J., Kumar, A., Trunov, A., Hao, K.C.G.: Safer smart contract programming with scilla. Proc. ACM Program. Lang. **3**(OOPSLA) (Oct 2019). https://doi.org/10.1145/3360611, https://doi.org/10.1145/3360611
14. Szabo, N.: Formalizing and securing relationships on public networks. First Monday **2**(9) (1997). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v2i9.548