

Ruby master - Bug #5759

flatten calls to_ary on everything

12/14/2011 08:55 AM - trans (Thomas Sawyer)

Status: Rejected	
Priority: Normal	
Assignee: nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)	
Target version: 1.9.3	
ruby -v: ruby 1.9.3dev (2011-09-23 revision 33323) [x86_64-linux]	Backport:
Description I often ensure that I have an array by doing: <pre>def foo=(x) @foo = [x].flatten end</pre> But this has turned into a problem as of late, as it seems #flatten is calling #to_ary on every element in the array, and apparently catching the error raised if #to_ary isn't defined for that object. But that causes potential issues with objects that use #method_missing. I think #flatten should use respond_to?(to_ary) to make sure an object can handle it before actually calling it.	
Related issues: Related to Ruby master - Bug #6039: lambda vs proc; #to_ary w/ splat bug Rejected 02/17/2012	

History

#1 - 12/14/2011 10:05 AM - drbrain (Eric Hodel)

Use Kernel#Array:

```
$ ruby -e 'p Array("a\nb"), Array(["a\nb"])'
["a\nb"]
["a\nb"]
```

#2 - 12/14/2011 07:23 PM - regularfry (Alex Young)

On 14/12/11 01:05, Eric Hodel wrote:

Issue [#5759](#) has been updated by Eric Hodel.

Use Kernel#Array:

```
$ ruby -e 'p Array("a\nb"), Array(["a\nb"])'
["a\nb"]
["a\nb"]
```

Or a splat:

```
ruby-1.9.3-p0 :001 > a="a\nb"; [*a]
=> ["a\nb"]
ruby-1.9.3-p0 :002 > a=["a\nb"]; [*a]
=> ["a\nb"]
```

Not sure I disagree that #flatten should check first (or just leave the exception uncaught) though.

--

Alex

Bug [#5759](#): flatten calls to_ary on everything
<http://redmine.ruby-lang.org/issues/5759>

Author: Thomas Sawyer
Status: Open
Priority: Normal
Assignee:

Category:
Target version: 1.9.3
ruby -v: ruby 1.9.3dev (2011-09-23 revision 33323) [x86_64-linux]

I often ensure that I have an array by doing:

```
def foo=(x)
  @foo = [x].flatten
end
```

But this has turned into a problem as of late, as it seems #flatten is calling #to_ary on every element in the array, and apparently catching the error raised if #to_ary isn't defined for that object. But that causes potential issues with objects that use #method_missing. I think #flatten should use respond_to?(:to_ary) to make sure an object can handle it before actually calling it.

#3 - 02/17/2012 04:09 AM - ddebernardy (Denis de Bernardy)

Possibly related:

<http://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/6039>

#4 - 03/11/2012 05:02 PM - ko1 (Koichi Sasada)

- Assignee set to nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

#5 - 03/18/2012 06:46 PM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

- Status changed from Open to Assigned

#6 - 12/30/2012 10:45 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

- Status changed from Assigned to Rejected

When you define method_missing, you have to also define respond_to_missing? properly.

#7 - 12/31/2012 05:15 AM - trans (Thomas Sawyer)

```
=begin
Isn't the the problem that it doesn't bother to check (({#respond_to?})) at all?
```

```
class Baz
  def method_missing(s)
    s
  end

  def respond_to_missing?(s, x)
    return false if s == :to_ary
    true
  end
end
```

```
end

b = Baz.new
b.respond_to?(:to_ary) #=> false
[Baz.new].flatten
=> in `flatten': can't convert Baz to Array (Baz#to_ary gives Symbol) (TypeError)

=end
```

#8 - 12/31/2012 10:46 AM - bitsweat (Jeremy Daer)

```
class Baz; def respond_to?(s, x) super unless s == :to_ary end end
=> nil
[Baz.new].flatten
=> [#Baz:0x007f8d3115c7d0]
```

#9 - 01/03/2013 12:10 PM - trans (Thomas Sawyer)

```
=begin
So it does call (({#respond_to?})) after all? Yet, I thought (({#respond_to_missing?})) was invented so people would not have to override
```

{{#respond_to}}). What's my misunderstanding? Surely we are not now expected to define both?
=end