

## Ruby trunk - Misc #15610

### Could bundler & rubygems be shipped in site\_ruby?

02/18/2019 03:11 PM - deivid (David Rodríguez)

<b>Status:</b>	Rejected	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	
<b>Assignee:</b>	hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)	
<b>Description</b>		
<p>Currently bundler &amp; rubygems are shipped together with the rest of the standard library (in RbConfig::CONFIG["rubylibdir"]). The fact that they share their folder with the rest of the standard library has caused some issues that wouldn't have happened if they were isolated. For example, <a href="https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/15469">https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/15469</a> or <a href="https://github.com/rubygems/rubygems/issues/2188">https://github.com/rubygems/rubygems/issues/2188</a>.</p> <p>Also, when you run <code>gem update --system</code>, rubygems installs a copy of itself and bundler in <code>site_ruby</code>, so you currently end up with two copies of different versions of bundler and rubygems in different folders of the <code>\$LOAD_PATH</code>.</p> <p><a href="#">hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)</a> has fixed the above issues with a patch to bundler in <a href="https://github.com/bundler/bundler/pull/6941">https://github.com/bundler/bundler/pull/6941</a>, but I still wonder whether it could be cleaner to ship them in <code>site_ruby</code> directly, so that <code>gem update --system</code> overwrites them and you always have a single default copy of both rubygems and bundler.</p> <p>Maybe this wouldn't be a good usage of <code>site_ruby</code>, and it's better to keep things as they are, but I figured I could ask ruby-core about it.</p> <p>Thanks for what you do!</p>		
<b>Related issues:</b>		
Related to Ruby trunk - Feature #15611: Shipping Bundler as a bundled gem, no...		<b>Rejected</b>

### History

#### #1 - 02/18/2019 03:29 PM - shevegen (Robert A. Heiler)

I can not answer the question, as I think that is up to the ruby core team, Hiroshi, the gem-team and the bundler team. However had perhaps it may be worthwhile to actually consider a new unified name? Perhaps for ruby 3.0 or if that is too early, ruby 4.0. And consider one unified application (e. g. both bundler and rubygems).

People could still decide on their own which functionality they would want to use (and I mean this in the sense of retaining all the functionality that currently exists). Although this may be too early ... I thought I would mention it at the least once.

This could also be discussed at an upcoming developer meeting - not solely the issue here alone, but long term goals and integration. If I recall correctly, `drbrain` years ago said that one reason for a merge of bundler + gem would be so to avoid code duplication (that was years before the work by Hiroshi and others).

#### #2 - 02/18/2019 06:35 PM - Eregon (Benoit Daloze)

- Related to Feature #15611: Shipping Bundler as a bundled gem, not a default gem added

#### #3 - 02/18/2019 06:36 PM - Eregon (Benoit Daloze)

[deivid \(David Rodríguez\)](#) I have another proposal in <https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/15611>, what do you think?

#### #4 - 02/18/2019 11:53 PM - hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)

- Assignee set to `hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)`

- Status changed from Open to Assigned

#### #5 - 03/08/2019 11:54 AM - hsbt (Hiroshi SHIBATA)

- Status changed from Assigned to Rejected

See <https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/15611#note-7>

#### #6 - 03/22/2019 03:32 PM - vo.x (Vit Ondruch)

Just for completeness, this is my proposal:

<https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/5617>