# Ruby - Feature #13252

# C API for creating strings without copying

02/25/2017 12:19 AM - tenderlovemaking (Aaron Patterson)

Status:	Assigned
Priority:	Normal
Assignee:	ko1 (Koichi Sasada)
Target version:	
Description	

Hi,

I'd like to have a C API that allows me to create String objects without copying the underlying char \*. Basically a C API similar to the rb\_str\_new\_static, but have the GC free the underlying char \* when the object dies. The use case is that at work we have C libraries that allocate char \* and we want to pass those to Ruby land without copying the buffer. Here is an example of what we're doing now:

https://github.com/arthurnn/memcached/commit/1886546944b420dc6953096ba1f5eae772001e31#diff-f508f9b8263ea397534b2b3f8 efed987R147

I'd like it if there was a public API for doing something like this.

Thank you!

P.S. I am sure I can't be the first to ask for this, but I couldn't find a similar issue in RedMine, so if this has been answered I apologize.

P.P.S. I've added a patch for kind of what I want.

### History

#### #1 - 02/25/2017 01:01 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

- Description updated

It is not guaranteed that ruby\_xfree can free a pointer allocated by other than ruby\_xmalloc and so on. You can't mix bare malloc and ruby\_xfree.

#### #2 - 03/01/2017 04:12 AM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

Nobuyoshi Nakada wrote:

It is not guaranteed that ruby\_xfree can free a pointer allocated by other than ruby\_xmalloc and so on. You can't mix bare malloc and ruby\_xfree.

Agreed. I heard that DLLs can have their own malloc() implementation on Windows. Even on POSIX variants, memory regions (e.g. mmap()-ed ones) are not always guaranteed to be free()-able.

This proposed C APIs are too easy to be misused when publicized. And misuse of them directly results in SEGV. I don't think it's a wise idea.

#### #3 - 03/01/2017 08:11 AM - normalperson (Eric Wong)

shyouhei@ruby-lang.org wrote:

Nobuyoshi Nakada wrote:

It is not guaranteed that ruby\_xfree can free a pointer allocated by other than ruby\_xmalloc and so on. You can't mix bare malloc and ruby\_xfree.

Agreed. I heard that DLLs can have their own malloc() implementation on Windows. Even on POSIX variants, memory regions (e.g. mmap()-ed ones) are not always guaranteed to be free()-able.

This proposed C APIs are too easy to be misused when publicized. And misuse of them directly results in SEGV. I don't think it's a wise idea.

One place we can use this in C Ruby is ruby\_getcwd() on GNU libc.

Yes, it's dangerous if misused. Perhaps having a way to plug-in

and redefine alloc/free/realloc functions would be safe on a per-T\_STRING basis.

We can maybe use FL\_USER{3,4,5}, and STR\_NOFREE flags for non-embed strings and allow up to 14 non-standard plug-in \*alloc implementations for users to define.

(4 bits; 16 implementations possible, 2 of which are built-in: 1: normal malloc 2: no-free, replacing existing STR\_NOFREE cases)

## #4 - 04/17/2017 07:03 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

normalperson (Eric Wong) wrote:

We can maybe use FL\_USER{3,4,5}, and STR\_NOFREE flags for non-embed strings and allow up to 14 non-standard plug-in \*alloc implementations for users to define.

FL\_USER{3,4,5} are for RSTRING\_EMBED\_LEN\_MASK.

## #5 - 04/17/2017 07:22 AM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

- Status changed from Open to Assigned

### #6 - 04/17/2017 07:22 AM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

- Assignee set to ko1 (Koichi Sasada)

#### Files

out.diff

1.66 KB 02/25/2017

tenderlovemaking (Aaron Patterson)