

Ruby - Bug #7827

Allow users to yield a block in string format

02/12/2013 02:47 AM - shevegen (Robert A. Heiler)

Status:	Rejected	Backport:
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:		
Target version:		
ruby -v:	1.9.3p385	
Description		
Hi.		
Not long ago I realized that you can use "invalid" syntax inside a ruby block.		
For instance:		
<pre>def foo; end</pre>		
<pre>foo() { ABC } # ABC is not known.</pre>		
This works, until you yield that.		
And if you yield it, that would fail, unless the ABC constant would be known. (Or perhaps a global variable instead, so let's consider:		
<pre>foo() { \$abc }</pre>		
So far so good.		
Now I actually had the idea that a ruby user might want to return the content of a block in string format, modify that string, and then somehow eval it (or .call it)		
Would that be useful? Or even possible?		
It probably is not so useful, but it would be kind of fun to be able to put whole classes inside a block, which later could get known, or turned into an unbound object again... Ok, I have no idea if this is useful at all. :)		
If it is just a crazy idea, just close it :D		
So my suggestion would be:		
<pre>def foo; end result = foo() { \$abc } \$abc = 5</pre>		
And here, either yield externally on result,		
or turn it into a proc somehow, and then		
before evaluating it, perhaps add a new		
method like:		
<pre>result.proc.proc_string # This here would return '\$abc'</pre> <p>which could then manually be eval()ed at a later</p>		

time.

I know, I have absolutely no use case for this, I just thought it would be cool to use invalid code inside {} and then perhaps later on turn this into valid ruby code (or use it in some other way, such as **END** and DATA.read)

Thanks for reading at least!

History

#1 - 02/12/2013 09:50 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

- *Status changed from Open to Rejected*

Adding it as a standard feature requires Ruby to hold source information, that leads to memory consumption. You might be interested in ruby2ruby for the purpose.

Matz.