

**Minutes of the:  
held in:  
on:**

**Ecma TC39-TG1  
Phone conference  
3<sup>rd</sup> May 2006**

## Attendees

Meeting time 10am PDT.

On phone:

- Francis Cheng, Adobe Systems
- Jeff Dyer, Adobe Systems
- Gary Grossman, Adobe Systems
- Ed Smith, Adobe Systems
- Pratap Lakshman, Microsoft
- Brendan Eich, Mozilla Foundation
- Graydon Hoare, Mozilla Foundation
- Blake Kaplan, Mozilla Foundation
- Dave Herman, Northeastern University
- Lars Thomas Hansen, Opera Software
- Cormac Flanagan, UC Santa Cruz

## Agenda

Note new meeting day of week for phone conferences.

- [package semantics](#)
- [multiple compilation units](#)
- [formal type system](#)
- other hot topics

## Discussion

- [package semantics](#)
  - packages declare two namespaces, `p.q#public` and `p.q#internal`
  - `import p.q` is in part like `use namespace p.q#public`
  - expression starting `p.q.x` is rewritten to `p.q#public::x`
    - even within package `p.q`, `p.q.x` is rewritten, so `x` must be `public`
    - `internal::x` or just `x` would work unless ambiguity requires full path
- [multiple compilation units](#)
  - Dave: what if you have package `p.q` with an `x` use but no `x` def; now add `x` to `p.q` after the compiler dealt with the first `x` use
    - Jeff: package compilation ends at verification or loading
    - Dave: so packages do involve separate compilation units

- Lars: see [multiple compilation units](#) for browser constraints
- Ed: AS3 ignores redefinition
  - two programs define utilities, pgm1 has A&B, pgm2 has B&C
  - they load in the same runtime, in that order
  - AS3 assumes first B is same as second B
- Brendan: browsers and ES1-3 of course have writeable function bindings
  - so last one wins
  - can we do better than last-wins for global functions or first-wins for classes and packages?
- Ed: hard to share common utility packages without getting too fine-grained
- Dave: what are use-cases for splitting up packages into multiple pieces?
  - Jeff: Java examples to avoid overlarge files
  - Dave: easy to unify that case at load time
  - Ed: package with hash table and tree
    - pgm1 uses hash table
    - pgm2 uses tree
  - Dave: why are those in the same package? Ok, pick a better example
  - Ed: explored a signature checksum scheme to verify Bs don't conflict
  - Ed: another example: graphing components for charting
    - also accessibility addons to the charting package
    - want accessibility stuff in a separate compilation unit
  - Brendan: first one wins is going to be hard to beat
  - Ed: Java does that within a classloader
  - Lars: anyone-wins is going to break on the web
    - Brendan: yeah, many `<script src®` cases are like `#include`, some are more like block-scoped import
  - Ed: Flash has application domains outside the AS3 language
    - you can create a sub-domain to isolate effects
    - lookups start with super-domain then go to sub-domain
  - Pratap: CLR2 has app domains too
  - Gary: Flash took inspiration from that, similar
  - Dave: shadowing is not mutability
  - Brendan: browsers name modules by URI, so no subversion via shadowing
  - Ed: packages are namespaces are URIs, so do tie into security and http caching
  - Graydon: content hashing better than relying on DNS
- [formal type system](#) questions
  - String to Boolean
    - no controversy on if, while, for, &&, ||, ! converting
    - `var x : Boolean = "hi"`
    - Jeff: that converts in AS3 in bang or tilde
      - compatibility requires this without type annotations
      - Brendan: could be stricter
      - Jeff: refactoring hazard
      - Cormac: tradeoff between type-checking and convenience/migration
  - Return from constructors
    - Brendan: ES1-3 allow function constructor to return a different object
    - Ed: class constructor functions cannot return expr; at all
      - but class ctors can return; to bail early
      - Brendan: different from rule in functions
      - Dave: how does type system talk about type of constructor?
        - so could allow constructors to have Void return type
        - and they could even contain return void 0 or whatever
      - Jeff: in AS3, function `f():void{...}` means ... cannot return expr;
      - Dave: type Void means can't return a value

- Brendan: then need type Undefined too
- Dave: need to review [proper tail calls](#) in light of this
- Ed: try this:
  - Void is type, has value undefined
  - f():void implies extra syntax restriction against return expr;
  - but otherwise doesn't affect type-checking, proper tail calls, etc.
- Dave: concerned about need to name Undefined or Null in unions, etc.
- Brendan, Ed: need special restriction on return expr; for
  - constructors
  - setters
  - generators
- with discussion
  - Using annotations and structural types, one can finally state the precise type of the object named in the `with` head
  - `let` declarations in body of `with` work as elsewhere
  - Apart from these orthogonal goods, can we reform `with`, or banish it?
    - `use strict` could banish it to a `{ use dynamic; ... }` block
    - does this really help? migration vs. new code, why do people use `with`?
- Global object unknowns
  - Brendan: [which prototype](#) proposes immutable `String`, etc.
  - `intrinsic::String` vs. `String` wouldn't differ if we adopt that proposal
  - `s.intrinsic::charAt(i)` would be different from `s.charAt(i)` for backward compatibility, to support AOP-ish hacking

```
class String {  
  . . .  
  intrinsic function charAt(i:uint):String {...}  
  prototype function charAt(i:*) :String {...}  
}
```

- [intrinsic proposal](#)
  - Use `intrinsic` instead of something like AS3 or ES4 for early binding.