

Ruby - Feature #9111

Encoding-free String comparison

11/14/2013 10:15 PM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

Status:	Open	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:		
Target version:		
Description =begin Currently, strings with the same content but with different encodings count as different strings. This causes strange behaviour as below (noted in StackOverflow question http://stackoverflow.com/questions/19977788/strange-behavior-in-packed-ruby-strings#19978206): <pre>[128].pack("C") # => "\x80" [128].pack("C") == "\x80" # => false</pre> Since [128].pack("C") has the encoding ASCII-8BIT and "\x80" (by default) has the encoding UTF-8, the two strings are not equal. Also, comparison of strings with different encodings may end up with a messy, unintended result. I suggest that the comparison String#<=> should not be based on the respective encoding of the strings, but all the strings should be internally converted to UTF-8 for the purpose of comparison. =end		
Related issues: Related to Ruby - Feature #10084: Add Unicode String Normalization to String ... Closed		

History

#1 - 11/14/2013 11:17 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada) wrote:

I suggest that the comparison String#<=> should not be based on the respective encoding of the strings, but all the strings should be internally converted to UTF-8 for the purpose of comparison.

It's unacceptable to always convert all strings to UTF-8, should restrict to comparison with an ASCII-8BIT string.

#2 - 11/15/2013 12:04 AM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

Following nobu's suggestion, I came up with the following several possibilities:

When two strings with different encodings are to be compared by String#<=>, then one of the following options should be taken:

- Raise a Warning message
- Raise an error
- Convert one of the strings to the other one.

I am not sure which option would be the best, but feel the feature should not be left as is now.

#3 - 11/15/2013 05:20 AM - Hanmac (Hans Mackowiak)

what about strings with the same encoding, but different content, but that is turned the same?
like "â" can be maked from "a" + "^" somehow, should they also treated as equal?

#4 - 11/15/2013 02:41 PM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

Hanmac: "â" can be maked from "a" + "^"

Treating them the same is too much, I think. There are various marking methods. For example, â would have a different marking in TeX. Assuming them equal is going too much. They should be treated differently.

#5 - 11/15/2013 05:15 PM - Hanmac (Hans Mackowiak)

i found the wikipedia source: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Combining_character
its not about treating "ª" or "a^" the same as "â" but there is a way to clue the chars together

i think thats also a reason for http://api.rubyonrails.org/classes/String.html#method-i-mb_chars ?

i found another interesting gems http://rubygems.org/gems/unicode_utils
with that is also possible to do something like this: "ª".upcase => "Ã"

there is another page about combining character: <http://sbp.so/supercombiner>

#6 - 11/21/2013 04:35 PM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)

Hanmac (Hans Mackowiak) wrote:

what about strings with the same encoding, but different content, but that is turned the same?
like "ª" can be maked from "a" + "ª" somehow, should they also treated as equal?

The standard practice is `NFD("ª") == NFD("a" + "ª")`.

To NFD, you can use some libraries.

see also <http://bibwild.wordpress.com/2013/11/19/benchmarking-ruby-unicode-normalization-alternatives/>

#7 - 07/23/2014 10:11 AM - duerst (Martin Dürst)

- Related to Feature #10084: Add Unicode String Normalization to String class added