

Ruby master - Bug #4487

require_relative fails in an eval'ed file

03/10/2011 03:25 AM - rogerdpack (Roger Pack)

Status: Closed	
Priority: Normal	
Assignee: matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)	
Target version:	
ruby -v: -	Backport:
Description =begin Hello all. \$cat eval_me1.rb eval(File.read('eval_me2.rb'), binding, File.expand_path('./eval_me2.rb')) \$cat eval_me2.rb require_relative 'eval_me1.rb' \$ ruby eval_me1.rb C:/dev/ruby/faster_require/spec/eval_me2.rb:1:in require_relative': cannot infer basepath (LoadError) from C:/dev/ruby/faster_require/spec/eval_me2.rb:1:in ' from eval_me1.rb:1:in eval' from eval_me1.rb:1:in ' I suppose was assuming that if eval included a filename, then require_relative would work from within it. Perhaps I am mistaken? Thanks! -r =end	
Related issues:	
Related to Ruby master - Bug #4352: [patch] Fix eval(s, b) backtrace; make ev...	Open
Related to Ruby master - Bug #7391: Allow to use require_relative from eval a...	Closed

History

#1 - 06/26/2011 06:27 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

- Status changed from Open to Assigned
- Assignee set to mame (Yusuke Endoh)

#2 - 07/05/2011 02:53 AM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- ruby -v changed from ruby 1.9.3dev (2011-03-04 trunk 31024) [i386-mingw32] to -

Hello,

```
Â $cat eval_me1.rb
Â eval(File.read('eval_me2.rb'), binding, File.expand_path('./eval_me2.rb'))
Â $cat eval_me2.rb
Â require_relative 'eval_me1.rb'
Â $ ruby eval_me1.rb
Â C:/dev/ruby/faster_require/spec/eval_me2.rb:1:in require_relative': cannot infer basepath (LoadError)
Â Â Â from C:/dev/ruby/faster_require/spec/eval_me2.rb:1:in '  
Â Â Â from eval_me1.rb:1:in eval'  
Â Â Â from eval_me1.rb:1:in '
```

I suppose was assuming that if eval included a filename, then require_relative would work from within it. Perhaps I am mistaken?

I think your expectation is reasonable, though I personally dislike the eval's feature to fake filepath.

The following patch makes require_relative use the given file path. I'm afraid if I should include this patch in 1.9.3 because I can't estimate the impact of this patch. What do you think?

```
diff --git a/vm_eval.c b/vm_eval.c
index 7df7f5f..3710401 100644
--- a/vm_eval.c
+++ b/vm_eval.c
@@ -1007,7 +1007,7 @@ eval_string_with_cref(VALUE self, VALUE src,
VALUE scope, NODE cref, const char
/make eval iseq */
th->parse_in_eval++;
th->mild_compile_error++;
```

- iseqval

#3 - 07/05/2011 12:52 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- Assignee changed from mame (Yusuke Endoh) to matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

Related to [#4352](#).

I need matz's judgment.

--
Yusuke Endoh mame@tsg.ne.jp

#4 - 07/05/2012 05:07 PM - LTe (Piotr Nielaćny)

```
=begin
If in irb we can execute
```

```
((load("file.rb")))
```

why we can't

```
((require_relative("file")))
```

Ruby just return exception (LoadError: cannot infer basepath). Unfortunately, this is a 'lie' because ruby can recognize basepath.
=end

#5 - 07/05/2012 05:26 PM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

```
=begin
```

[LTe \(Piotr Nielaćny\)](#) sorry, I can't get it. load loads from \$LOAD_PATH, while require_relative requires from relative path. They are different.

```
=end
```

#6 - 07/06/2012 04:04 PM - LTe (Piotr Nielaćny)

[shyouhei \(Shyouhei Urabe\)](#) yes I agree but load method tries to load file from relative path. When load method can't find file in relative path it loads from \$LOAD_PATH. The same can be done by require_relative (recognize path).

<https://github.com/ruby/ruby/pull/139>

#7 - 07/06/2012 05:52 PM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

```
=begin
```

[LTe \(Piotr Nielaćny\)](#) I'd rather ask you "require_relative loads something relative from WHAT?"

Obviously it is not relative from your mind :)

Current require_relative loads relative from where the require_relative command is written. So when in IRB sessions, it fails to infer where it is because the command is written in a non-file (console).

OTOH load loads from process PWD, which is possible in IRB.

So the point is, if you want require_relative to work on an IRB session, you have to define "from where require_relative should search relativeness".
=end

#8 - 07/06/2012 06:13 PM - Eregon (Benoit Daloze)

shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe) wrote:

Current require_relative loads relative from where the require_relative command is written. So when in IRB sessions, it fails to infer where it is because the command is written in a non-file (console).

OTOH load loads from process PWD, which is possible in IRB.

So the point is, if you want `require_relative` to work on an IRB session, you have to define "from where `require_relative` should search relativeness".

From the process current working directory I guess, especially since you almost always launch IRB from a terminal.

Personally I'm doing `require './myfile'` which is not the most elegant, but if you don't have completion in IRB, that's shorter to type.

Otherwise, there's always the option to do `irb -I.` and use plain `require`.

#9 - 07/06/2012 06:59 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

Eregon (Benoit Daloze) wrote:

shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe) wrote:

Current `require_relative` loads relative from where the `require_relative` command is written. So when in IRB sessions, it fails to infer where it is because the command is written in a non-file (console).

OTOH `load` loads from process PWD, which is possible in IRB.

So the point is, if you want `require_relative` to work on an IRB session, you have to define "from where `require_relative` should search relativeness".

From the process current working directory I guess, especially since you almost always launch IRB from a terminal.

Personally I'm doing `require './myfile'` which is not the most elegant, but if you don't have completion in IRB, that's shorter to type.

Otherwise, there's always the option to do `irb -I.` and use plain `require`.

`require_relative` is introduced to avoid accidentally require a malicious file on the current working directory.

So it can't be acceptable.

Use `require` or `load` on such case.

#10 - 07/06/2012 07:08 PM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

naruse (Yui NARUSE) wrote:

`require_relative` is introduced to avoid accidentally require a malicious file on the current working directory.

So it can't be acceptable.

Use `require` or `load` on such case.

I'm not pretty sure about this. Is there a chance for a (proposed behaviour of) `require_relative` to require a malicious file on the current directory?

Because you are on an IRB session and intentionally emitting `require_relative` (not `require`), I doubt the danger you say.

#11 - 07/06/2012 07:21 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe) wrote:

naruse (Yui NARUSE) wrote:

`require_relative` is introduced to avoid accidentally require a malicious file on the current working directory.

So it can't be acceptable.

Use `require` or `load` on such case.

I'm not pretty sure about this. Is there a chance for a (proposed behaviour of) `require_relative` to require a malicious file on the current directory?

Because you are on an IRB session and intentionally emitting `require_relative` (not `require`), I doubt the danger you say.

- `irb` is not the only user of `eval`.
- A user won't always use `require_relative` intentionally.
- There is a suitable another way: `require './myfile'`

With those reason, I don't think `require_relative` should be changed.

#12 - 07/06/2012 08:06 PM - Eregon (Benoit Daloze)

naruse (Yui NARUSE) wrote:

Eregon (Benoit Daloze) wrote:

From the process current working directory I guess, especially since you almost always launch IRB from a terminal.

require_relative is introduced to avoid accidentally require a malicious file on the current working directory.
So it can't be acceptable.
Use require or load on such case.

I see, you're right.

Indeed, with this in mind I think it's not worth changing, and the actual require_relative behavior is clearer (relative to "this file" directory, if there is no accurate "this file", just #raise).

#13 - 07/14/2012 02:59 PM - ko1 (Koichi Sasada)

- Assignee changed from matz (Yukihiko Matsumoto) to mame (Yusuke Endoh)

mame-san, please ask matz.

#14 - 02/02/2013 01:06 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- Subject changed from require_relative fails in an eval'ed file to require_relative fails in an eval'ed file

- Assignee changed from mame (Yusuke Endoh) to matz (Yukihiko Matsumoto)

- Target version set to 2.6

#15 - 03/23/2013 02:50 PM - Conrad.Irwin (Conrad Irwin)

This bug also affects pry: <https://github.com/pry/pry/issues/880>. Our use-case is slightly different because we are doing TOPLEVEL_BINDING.eval("some code", "/absolute/path.rb").

I think that when an absolute path is set in eval, then require_relative should use it.

#16 - 08/18/2015 02:28 PM - julik (Julik Tarkhanov)

This is actually very pertinent for Rack as well, because currently config.ru does not support require_relative which is very counterintuitive.

#17 - 12/07/2017 11:49 AM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- Status changed from Assigned to Closed

Now, it works. I'm unsure who changed the behavior... Anyway, closing.