

Ruby master - Bug #5542

Ruby 1.9.3-p0 changed arity on default initialization method

11/02/2011 05:32 AM - jballanc (Joshua Ballanco)

Status: Rejected	
Priority: Normal	
Assignee: marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)	
Target version: 1.9.3	
ruby -v: ruby 1.9.3p0 (2011-10-30 revision 33570) [x86_64-darwin11.2.0]	Backport:
Description The following code worked under 1.9.2-p290 but breaks with an Argument Error (1 for 0) under 1.9.3-p0: <pre>class Foo; end Foo.new(nil)</pre> Furthermore, the reported arity for Object's initialize method has changed: <pre>ruby-1.9.2-p290 :001 > Object.instance_method(:initialize).arity => -1 ruby-1.9.3-p0 :001 > Object.instance_method(:initialize).arity => 0</pre>	
Related issues: Related to Ruby master - Feature #2451: BasicObject.initialize with variable ... Closed 12/07/2009	

History

#1 - 11/03/2011 06:19 AM - jballanc (Joshua Ballanco)

This was introduced in r29638:

```
* object.c: Make BasicObject.new accept no parameter.
  Revert of r26135 [ruby-core:27080], as per [ruby-core:32952].
```

Was this change in BasicObject.new intentional? If so, is it intentional that this behavior should be different than 1.9.2? If not can we have this back-ported?

#2 - 11/03/2011 08:50 AM - kosaki (Motohiro KOSAKI)

- Category set to core
- Status changed from Open to Assigned
- Assignee set to marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
- Target version set to 1.9.3

#3 - 11/04/2011 01:23 AM - Anonymous

On Thu, Nov 03, 2011 at 06:19:19AM +0900, Joshua Ballanco wrote:

Issue [#5542](#) has been updated by Joshua Ballanco.

This was introduced in r29638:

```
* object.c: Make BasicObject.new accept no parameter.
  Revert of r26135 [ruby-core:27080], as per [ruby-core:32952].
```

Was this change in BasicObject.new intentional? If so, is it intentional that this behavior should be different than 1.9.2? If not can we have this back-ported?

Yes, this was definitely an intentional change. Please see the threads mentioned in the commit message ([ruby-core:27080] and [ruby-core:32952]).

I cannot speak for backporting this to 1.9.2.

--

Aaron Patterson
<http://tenderlovmaking.com/>

#4 - 11/04/2011 02:23 AM - jballanc (Joshua Ballanco)

On Thu, Nov 3, 2011 at 12:15 PM, Aaron Patterson
tenderlove@ruby-lang.org wrote:

On Thu, Nov 03, 2011 at 06:19:19AM +0900, Joshua Ballanco wrote:

Issue [#5542](#) has been updated by Joshua Ballanco.

This was introduced in r29638:

```
* object.c: Make BasicObject.new accept no parameter.  
  Revert of r26135 [ruby-core:27080], as per [ruby-core:32952].
```

Was this change in BasicObject.new intentional? If so, is it intentional that this behavior should be different than 1.9.2? If not can we have this back-ported?

Yes, this was definitely an intentional change. Please see the threads mentioned in the commit message ([ruby-core:27080] and [ruby-core:32952]).

I can access the former thread, but the later [ruby-core:32952] seems to have gone missing?

<http://blade.nagaokaut.ac.jp/cgi-bin/scat.rb/ruby/ruby-core/32952>

I cannot speak for backporting this to 1.9.2.

I suppose backporting is not a huge issue (I actually caught this due to some less-than-optimally implemented code in our code base), however I worry about having this kind of a semantic change between minor versions.

- Josh

#5 - 11/05/2011 11:09 AM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)

- Status changed from Assigned to Rejected

Hi,

I can access the former thread, but the later [ruby-core:32952] seems to have gone missing?

<http://blade.nagaokaut.ac.jp/cgi-bin/scat.rb/ruby/ruby-core/32952>

Indeed, the archive contains only half of the discussion about the revert. It starts at [ruby-core:32932]. Matz's [ruby-core:32952] is quoted in some replies.

<http://blade.nagaokaut.ac.jp/cgi-bin/vframe.rb/ruby/ruby-core/32932?32833-33811+split-mode-vertical>

I cannot speak for backporting this to 1.9.2.

Yugui decided against it in [ruby-core:33035] and warn instead, so I'm closing this issue.

#6 - 11/06/2011 02:45 PM - jballanc (Joshua Ballanco)

Thank you much for the information. This seems like a good compromise.

Files

noname	500 Bytes	11/04/2011	Anonymous
--------	-----------	------------	-----------