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**Description**

> =begin

Since r38118, `((test-rubyspect))` fails in `((rubyspec/core/marshal/dump_spec.rb))`.

- **Before r38117**
  
  ```bash
  $ export MSPECOPT='-e "Marshal.dump with an Object dump a BasicObject subclass if it defines respond_to?" 
core/marshal/dump_spec.rb'
  $ make test-rubyspec
  ./miniruby -I./lib -I. -I.ext/common ./tool/runruby.rb --extout=.ext  
  --disable-gems ./spec/mspec/bin/mspec run -B ./spec/default.mspec 
  -e "Marshal.dump with an Object dumps a BasicObject subclass if it defines respond_to?"  
core/marshal/dump_spec.rb
  ruby 2.0.0dev (2012-12-01 trunk 38117) [x86_64-darwin11.4.2]
  .
  Finished in 0.045351 seconds
  1 file, 1 example, 1 expectation, 0 failures, 0 errors
  
- **After r38117**
  
  ```bash
  $ make test-rubyspec
  ./miniruby -I./lib -I. -I.ext/common ./tool/runruby.rb --extout=.ext  
  --disable-gems ./spec/mspec/bin/mspec run -B ./spec/default.mspec 
  -e "Marshal.dump with an Object dumps a BasicObject subclass if it defines respond_to?"  
core/marshal/dump_spec.rb
  ruby 2.0.0dev (2012-12-01 trunk 38118) [x86_64-darwin11.4.2]
  E
  1)
  Marshal.dump with an Object dumps a BasicObject subclass if it defines respond_to? ERROR
  ArgumentError: wrong number of arguments (2 for 1)
  /tmp/ruby/trunk/feature-6539/spec/rubyspec/core/marshal/fixtures/marshal_data.rb:158:in respond_to?
  /tmp/ruby/trunk/feature-6539/spec/rubyspec/core/marshal/fixtures/marshal_data.rb:397:in dump'
  /tmp/ruby/trunk/feature-6539/spec/rubyspec/core/marshal/dump_spec.rb:397:in block (4 levels) in <top (required)>'
  /tmp/ruby/trunk/feature-6539/spec/rubyspec/core/marshal/dump_spec.rb:5:in'
  Finished in 0.045077 seconds
  1 file, 1 example, 0 expectations, 0 failures, 1 error
  make: *** [test-rubyspec] Error 1
  
  r38118 changes to call `((respond_to?)))` method with `((include_all)) as `((true))`, so
  that private methods can be found, cf. [Feature #6539]

  The choices what I can thought out are:

  1) change RubySpect to take the flag as a rest argument
  2) reject Feature #6539 call respond_to? according to its arity

  Attach the patches for (3).

=end
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History

#1 - 01/22/2013 04:33 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)
- Description updated

#2 - 01/25/2013 11:56 AM - ko1 (Koichi Sasada)
- Priority changed from Normal to 6
- Target version set to 2.0.0

#3 - 01/31/2013 04:58 PM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
I am not that confident that I understand all the detail, but I vote for drop include_all flags.

Matz.

#4 - 02/05/2013 03:58 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafontaine)
The issue is that rb_obj_respond_to sends a second argument (include private) even when the user method doesn't accept one.

It should be fixed to only send one in those cases.

This is exactly what check_funcall_respond_to does already.

Both functions should probably be refactored.

#5 - 02/05/2013 04:25 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)
- Status changed from Assigned to Closed
- % Done changed from 0 to 100
This issue was solved with changeset r39069.
Nobuyoshi, thank you for reporting this issue.
Your contribution to Ruby is greatly appreciated.
May Ruby be with you.
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</thead>
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