

Ruby - Feature #2635

Unbundle rdoc

01/23/2010 11:20 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

Status:	Rejected	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:	matz (Yukihiko Matsumoto)	
Target version:	1.9.2	
Description =begin The rdoc in trunk is outdated and not maintained, and latest rdoc is in gen. I think Ruby 1.9 shouldn't bundle such old rdoc. People who needs rdoc should install from gem. =end		
Related issues:		
Related to Ruby - Bug #883: Failure: test_handle_special_CROSSREF_no_undersco...	Closed	12/15/2008
Related to Ruby - Bug #1042: RDoc crashes while generating HTML after parsing...	Closed	01/23/2009
Related to Ruby - Bug #1234: RDoc failure in benchmark/bm_so_meteor_contest.r...	Closed	03/01/2009
Related to Ruby - Bug #1948: RDoc Fails with Non-ASCII Pathnames	Closed	08/18/2009
Related to Ruby - Bug #2066: Merge Latest RDoc/Ri	Closed	09/09/2009
Related to Ruby - Feature #5481: Gemifying Ruby standard library	Closed	

History

#1 - 01/23/2010 11:48 PM - matz (Yukihiko Matsumoto)

=begin
Hi,

In message "Re: [\[ruby-core:27722\]](#) [Feature #2635] Unbundle rdoc"
on Sat, 23 Jan 2010 23:20:59 +0900, Yui NARUSE redmine@ruby-lang.org writes:

|The rdoc in trunk is outdated and not maintained,
|and latest rdoc is in gen.

|

|I think Ruby 1.9 shouldn't bundle such old rdoc.
|People who needs rdoc should install from gem.

Or bundle newer rdoc?

matz.

=end

#2 - 01/24/2010 12:15 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

=begin
Bug [#2066](#) is written by Run Paint Run Run 136 days ago, but it is not yet.

Moreover rdoc has some open bugs for 1 year.
test-all failure and crash bugs need to fixed but not fixed.
I, maintaining Redmine's tickets, hate those unmaintained libraries.
=end

#3 - 01/24/2010 12:36 AM - matz (Yukihiko Matsumoto)

=begin
Hi,

In message "Re: [\[ruby-core:27725\]](#) [Feature #2635] Unbundle rdoc"
on Sun, 24 Jan 2010 00:15:33 +0900, Yui NARUSE redmine@ruby-lang.org writes:

|Moreover rdoc has some open bugs for 1 year.
|test-all failure and crash bugs need to fixed but not fixed.

|], maintaining Redmine's tickets, hate those unmaintained libraries.

In that case, should we ask for new volunteer instead of removing it?

matz.

=end

#4 - 01/24/2010 12:41 AM - luislavena (Luis Lavena)

=begin

On Sat, Jan 23, 2010 at 12:15 PM, Yui NARUSE redmine@ruby-lang.org wrote:

Moreover rdoc has some open bugs for 1 year.
test-all failure and crash bugs need to fixed but not fixed.
I, maintaining Redmine's tickets, hate those unmaintained libraries.

Is my understanding that rdoc has been updated and maintained by Eric Hodel, at least eh gem was.

If integration with Ruby is the problem, then removal and optional installation for the user should be the solution, right?

Luis Lavena AREA 17

Perfection in design is achieved not when there is nothing more to add, but rather when there is nothing more to take away.
Antoine de Saint-Exupéry

=end

#5 - 01/24/2010 12:52 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

=begin

(2010/01/24 0:35), Yukihiro Matsumoto wrote:

|Moreover rdoc has some open bugs for 1 year.
|test-all failure and crash bugs need to fixed but not fixed.
|I, maintaining Redmine's tickets, hate those unmaintained libraries.

In that case, should we ask for new volunteer instead of removing it?

If someone maintain rdoc lib in Ruby, it is clear.

--

NARUSE, Yui naruse@airemix.jp

=end

#6 - 01/24/2010 12:53 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

=begin

Hi,

In message "Re: [\[ruby-core:27729\]](#) Re: [Feature [#2635](#)] Unbundle rdoc"
on Sun, 24 Jan 2010 00:41:18 +0900, Luis Lavena luislavena@gmail.com writes:

|Is my understanding that rdoc has been updated and maintained by Eric Hodel, at least eh gem was.

|
|If integration with Ruby is the problem, then removal and optional installation for the user should be the solution, right?

That's what I don't understand. Eric has commit privilege. If he still maintains rdoc gem, I see no reason he doesn't update the bundled rdoc as well. If he stops maintaining rdoc, we need new maintainer. If he keeps working on it, I expect him to update bundled rdoc as well.

matz.

=end

#7 - 01/24/2010 12:59 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

=begin

(2010/01/24 0:41), Luis Lavena wrote:

On Sat, Jan 23, 2010 at 12:15 PM, Yui NARUSE redmine@ruby-lang.org wrote:

Moreover rdoc has some open bugs for 1 year.
test-all failure and crash bugs need to fixed but not fixed.
I, maintaining Redmine's tickets, hate those unmaintained libraries.

Is my understanding that rdoc has been updated and maintained by Eric Hodel, at least eh gem was.

I think so too.

If integration with Ruby is the problem, then removal and optional installation for the user should be the solution, right?

Yeah, I think so.

rdoc is pure ruby, so it won't be a severe problem,
even if Ruby's installation process needs some changes.

--

NARUSE, Yui naruse@airemix.jp

=end

#8 - 01/24/2010 12:04 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

=begin

Hi,

2010/1/23 Yukihiro Matsumoto matz@ruby-lang.org:

In message "Re: [\[ruby-core:27722\]](#) [Feature [#2635](#)] Unbundle rdoc"
on Sat, 23 Jan 2010 23:20:59 +0900, Yui NARUSE redmine@ruby-lang.org writes:

|The rdoc in trunk is outdated and not maintained,
|and latest rdoc is in gen.

|
|I think Ruby 1.9 shouldn't bundle such old rdoc.
|People who needs rdoc should install from gem.

Or bundle newer rdoc?

I don't know much about the "latest" rdoc, but according to [\[ruby-core:27667\]](#),
I understand that simply updating causes compatibility problem because:

The latest RDoc no longer has the HTML generator at all.

The reporter in [\[ruby-core:27656\]](#) followed proper reporting procedure (i.e.,
tested and patched against 1.9 trunk). Ruby's development process is wrong.
It is too confusing for rdoc to have independent trunk.

In [\[ruby-core:27667\]](#),

I fixed this memory issue by deleting the file.

is equal to "I fixed in my own environment!" It does not answer.

I wonder why some standard libraries (RubyGems, Rake, rdoc, etc.) need
to have independent development process and independent release.

I said in [\[ruby-core:26679\]](#), they should be developed and released with
ruby core if they are really parts of ruby core.

--

Yusuke ENDOH mame@tsg.ne.jp

=end

#9 - 01/25/2010 03:31 PM - zenspider (Ryan Davis)

=begin

On Jan 23, 2010, at 19:03 , Yusuke ENDOH wrote:

The reporter in [\[ruby-core:27656\]](#) followed proper reporting procedure (i.e., tested and patched against 1.9 trunk). Ruby's development process is wrong. It is too confusing for rdoc to have independent trunk.

Then we should eject ALL of standard lib from trunk. Gemify all of them and kick them out the door.

Maybe we should bundle some gems, but they should install as actual gems and be freely upgradable by the user.

Like it or not, rdoc, minitest (and test/unit), rubygems, rexml, and yaml (and others?) are all separate products that are produced independent of trunk. In my opinion, it works BETTER that way, not worse. What doesn't work is having to slow down releases because ruby releases are so few and far between.

=end

#10 - 01/25/2010 03:52 PM - jbarnette (John Barnette)

=begin

On Sun, Jan 24, 2010 at 10:31 PM, Ryan Davis ryand-ruby@zenspider.com wrote:

Like it or not, rdoc, minitest (and test/unit), rubygems, rexml, and yaml (and others?) are all separate products that are produced independent of trunk. In my opinion, it works BETTER that way, not worse. What doesn't work is having to slow down releases because ruby releases are so few and far between.

Rake. Rex. Racc.

~ j.

=end

#11 - 01/25/2010 04:39 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

=begin

On Mon, Jan 25, 2010 at 3:31 PM, Ryan Davis ryand-ruby@zenspider.com wrote:

On Jan 23, 2010, at 19:03 , Yusuke ENDOH wrote:

The reporter in [\[ruby-core:27656\]](#) followed proper reporting procedure (i.e., tested and patched against 1.9 trunk). Ruby's development process is wrong. It is too confusing for rdoc to have independent trunk.

Then we should eject ALL of standard lib from trunk. Gemify all of them and kick them out the door.

Maybe we should bundle some gems, but they should install as actual gems and be freely upgradable by the user.

Like it or not, rdoc, minitest (and test/unit), rubygems, rexml, and yaml (and others?) are all separate products that are produced independent of trunk. In my opinion, it works BETTER that way, not worse. What doesn't work is having to slow down releases because ruby releases are so few and far between.

I don't think it is a problem that some libraries are developed out of Ruby's repos, until the maintainer fixes bugs created in Ruby's Redmine and update the lib in trunk. Current minitest, nkf, JSON, is doing that. (I maintain nkf and JSON) REXML, YAML, racc are not developed. rake doesn't but not have reported bugs.

--

NARUSE, Yui
naruse@airemix.jp

=end

#12 - 01/25/2010 05:46 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

=begin
Hi,

2010/1/25 Ryan Davis ryand-ruby@zenspider.com:

On Jan 23, 2010, at 19:03 , Yusuke ENDOH wrote:

The reporter in [\[ruby-core:27656\]](#) followed proper reporting procedure (i.e., tested and patched against 1.9 trunk). Ruby's development process is wrong. It is too confusing for rdoc to have independent trunk.

In my opinion, it works BETTER that way, not worse.

It brings some benefits, but problems actually occur.

- slow synchronization between the "latest" and ruby trunk
- empty answer that the issue is fixed in the "latest"
- neglect of tickets in ruby's redmine
- incompatible change to the "latest"

These problems do not occur or are detected early if they are developed in ruby trunk. Nobody would say anything if such a problem does not occur, I think.

--

Yusuke ENDOH mame@tsg.ne.jp

=end

#13 - 03/03/2010 01:10 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

- Status changed from Assigned to Rejected

=begin

=end

#14 - 02/08/2017 09:59 AM - hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)

- Related to Feature #5481: Gemifying Ruby standard library added