Record & Tuple

Stage 1 Update @ TC39 June 2020

Robin Ricard & Rick Button Bloomberg

Advisor: Daniel Ehrenberg Igalia

A recap of last update

Syntax

```
const contents = #[
    #{
        text: "Record and Tuple",
        font: "Comic Sans",
    #{
        text: "An ECMA TC39 Stage 1 Proposal",
    },
```

```
// no methods in records
#{
  method() {
     // not allowed
  },
// no holes in tuples
#[1,,2]; // not allowed
```

XQ

Equality Semantics



#[-0] !== #[+0]

#[NaN] === #[NaN]

Issues #20 / #65
Actively being discussed

or

#[-0] === #[+0]

New since the last update

Disallowing symbols as property keys in records

```
// Insertion order must not matter for equality.
const one = #{ a: 0, b: 1 };
const two = #{ b: 1, a: 0 };
assert(one === two);
```

// Solution: Record keys are sorted.

Object.keys(#{ a: 0, b: 1 }); // ["a", "b"]

Object.keys(#{ b: 1, a: 0 }); // ["a", "b"]

```
// What about symbol keys?
const sym1 = Symbol();
const sym2 = Symbol();
const rec = #{
  [sym1]: "foo",
  [sym2]: "bar",
};
```

Object.getOwnPropertySymbols(rec) // ???

No way to order symbol keys without a global order for unregistered symbols

However, concerns with global symbol order introducing side-channel (see issue #15)

Thus, disallowing symbols as keys in Records is our solution.

```
// TypeError
const rec = #{ [Symbol("foo")]: "foo" };
// TypeError
const rec = #{ [Symbol.for("foo")]: "foo" };
```

Destructuring Syntax?

Briefly mentioned last meeting

```
// already possible
const { foo } = #{ foo: "foo" };
asserts(foo === "foo");
// rest properties work for Record/Tuple
const { foo, ...rest } = #{ foo: "foo", bar: "bar" };
// :(
assert(typeof rest === "object");
```

```
// rest properties/elements syntax for Record/Tuple?
const #{ foo, ...rest } = #{ foo: "foo", bar: "bar" };
assert(rest === #{ bar: "bar" });
```

```
const #[one, two, ...rest] = #[1,2,3,4,5];
assert(rest === #[3,4,5]);
```

```
// tricky (but expected) behavior
// if destructuring an object with
// object property values into a "rest properties Record"
const #{ foo, ...rest } = { foo: 123, bar: {} };
// ^ TypeError, can't create Record containing object
```

```
const #{ bar, ...rest } = { foo: 123, bar: {} };
// works, but feels bad
```

Destructuring Syntax?

Resolution: Omit, investigate further in the future

Please try the Record and Tuple Playground!

https://tinyurl.com/RecordTupleFeedback

```
    https://rickbutton.github.io/recor x +

  🗦 🧷 🕯 rickbutton.github.io/record-tuple-playground/#eyJjb250ZW50IjoiaW1wb3J0lHsgUmVjb3JkLCBUdXBsZSB9IGZyb20gXCJyZWNvcmQtYW5kLXR1cGxlLXBvbHlmaWxsXCl7XG5jb25zdCBsb2cgPSBjb25zb2xlLmxvZztcblxuY29uc3QgcmVjb... 🕏 🔞 🚦
                                                                                                                    Record and Tuple Playground Proposal Polyfill
                                                                                                     1 import { Record, Tuple } from "record-and-tuple-polyfill";
 2 const log = console.log;
                                                                                                     ►(2) ["isRecord", false]
                                                                                                      ►(3) ["simple", true, true]
    const record = #{ prop: 1 };
                                                                                                      ▶(2) ["nested", true]
     const tuple = #[1, 2, 3];
                                                                                                     ►(2) ["!order", true]
                                                                                                      ► (2) ["-0 === +0", true]
     log("isRecord", Record.isRecord(record));
                                                                                                      ▶(2) ["#[-0] === #[+0]", false]
     log("isRecord", Record.isRecord({ prop: 1 }));
                                                                                                      ► (2) ["NaN === NaN", false]
                                                                                                      ▶(2) ["#[NaN] === #[NaN]", true]
     log("simple",
         #{ a: 1 } === #{ a:1 },
         #[1] === #[1]);
     log("nested", #{ a: #{ b: 123 }} === #{ a: #{ b: 123 }});
    log("!order", #{ a: 1, b: 2 } === #{ b: 2, a: 1});
22 \log("-0 === +0", -0 === +0);
23 \log(\#[-0] === \#[+0], \#[-0] === \#[+0];
26 log("NaN === NaN", NaN === NaN);
    log("#[NaN] === #[NaN]", #[NaN] === #[NaN]);
```

Seeking Stage 2 in July

- We believe we have a proper design for Record and Tuple
- Received good feedback on proposed solutions, hope to have more feedback on polyfill usage before Stage 2
- We have started spec work, intend to complete "first pass" before July meeting

Does anyone have additional considerations before Stage 2?

Discussion!

- Syntax/Grammar
- Equality Semantics
- Disallowing symbols as property keys in Records

Feedback before seeking Stage 2 in July?