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Description
"<<" is a frequently used method in text manipulation. Meanwhile, it's also the beginning token of a here-document. Sometimes it may be confusing to newbies.

Unlike Perl, in which "<>" is a very very frequently used operator to read lines from a filehandle, in Ruby, "<>" has no meaning. So I think it can be used to represent Here Document, so as to reduce the possibility of misunderstanding method "<<" and here-document token "<<". And In my opinion, <> is more clear than <<, because it looks like kind of brackets.

For example,

```ruby
str = <SECT1>.upcase + <SECT2>.downcase
aaaaaa
SECT1
XXXXXX
SECT2
```

may be clearer than:

```ruby
str = <<SECT1.upcase + <<SECT2.downcase
```

History

#1 - 09/23/2011 10:37 AM - duerst (Martin Dürst)

If anything is done in this direction, I'd prefer

```ruby
str = <>SECT1.upcase + <>SECT2.downcase
```

over

```ruby
str = <SECT1>.upcase + <SECT2>.downcase
```

It seems to stick out much better.

#2 - 09/23/2011 10:53 AM - yeban (Anurag Priyam)

On Fri, Sep 23, 2011 at 7:08 AM, Martin DÃ¼rst duerst@it.aoyama.ac.jp wrote:

[...]

If anything is done in this direction, I'd prefer

```ruby
Â стр
```

#3 - 09/24/2011 05:25 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

Joey Zhou wrote:

Unlike Perl, in which "<>" is a very very frequently used operator to read lines from a filehandle, in Ruby, "<>" has no meaning. So I think it can be used to represent Here Document, so as to reduce the possibility of misunderstanding method "<<" and here-document token "<<". And In my opinion, <> is more clear than <<, because it looks like kind of brackets.

I'm somewhat negative.

It looks like Perl's "<>" but is pretty different, so I'm afraid that it would be also confusing.

#4 - 09/26/2011 12:06 AM - yimutang (Joey Zhou)

Nobuyoshi Nakada wrote:
I'm somewhat negative. It looks like Perl's "<>" but is pretty different, so I'm afraid that it would be also confusing.

There are a few things different in Ruby and Perl.

$foo is not a scalar, @bar is not an array, %w is not a hash

"re = /pattern/" in Ruby means assigning a regexp to re, but in Perl "$re = /pattern/" means "$re = $$_ =~ /pattern/"...

So I think the difference is not a problem, some differences already exist.

"<<" of Perl has two meanings: shifting bits and here document. One is for the integers and the other is for the string, maybe leading to less confusing. However, in Ruby, "<<" is instance method of String and IO/File, and here document is also string, the probability of confusing is larger, I'm afraid.

Rejected. I don't want to change the basic syntax (without major benefit). Besides that, I want to keep <> for future syntax extension.

Matz.