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Judging from comp.lang.python and other forums, Python 2.5’s new [**~~with~~** ~~statement~~](http://effbot.org/pyref/with.htm) (dead link) seems to be a bit confusing even for experienced Python programmers.

As most other things in Python, the **with** statement is actually very simple, once you understand the problem it’s trying to solve. Consider this piece of code:

set things up

try:

do something

finally:

tear things down

Here, “set things up” could be opening a file, or acquiring some sort of external resource, and “tear things down” would then be closing the file, or releasing or removing the resource. The **try-finally** construct guarantees that the “tear things down” part is always executed, even if the code that does the work doesn’t finish.

If you do this a lot, it would be quite convenient if you could put the “set things up” and “tear things down” code in a library function, to make it easy to reuse. You can of course do something like

def controlled\_execution(callback):

set things up

try:

callback(thing)

finally:

tear things down

def my\_function(thing):

do something

controlled\_execution(my\_function)

But that’s a bit verbose(冗余), especially if you need to modify local variables. Another approach is to use a one-shot generator, and use the **for-in** statement to “wrap” the code:

def controlled\_execution():

set things up

try:

yield thing

finally:

tear things down

for thing in controlled\_execution():

do something with thing

But **yield** isn’t even allowed inside a **try-finally** in 2.4 and earlier. And while that could be fixed (and it has been fixed in 2.5), it’s still a bit weird to use a loop construct when you know that you only want to execute something once.

So after contemplating a number of alternatives, GvR and the python-dev team finally came up with a generalization of the latter, using an object instead of a generator to control the behaviour of an external piece of code:

class controlled\_execution:

def \_\_enter\_\_(self):

set things up

return thing

def \_\_exit\_\_(self, type, value, traceback):

tear things down

with controlled\_execution() as thing:

some code

Now, when the “with” statement is executed, Python evaluates the expression, calls the **\_\_enter\_\_** method on the resulting value (which is called a “context guard”), and assigns whatever **\_\_enter\_\_** returns to the variable given by **as**. Python will then execute the code body, and *no matter what happens in that code*, call the guard object’s **\_\_exit\_\_** method.

As an extra bonus, the **\_\_exit\_\_** method can look at the exception, if any, and suppress it or act on it as necessary. To suppress the exception, just return a true value. For example, the following **\_\_exit\_\_** method swallows any **TypeError**, but lets all other exceptions through:

def \_\_exit\_\_(self, type, value, traceback):

return isinstance(value, TypeError)

In Python 2.5, the file object has been equipped with（引入） **\_\_enter\_\_** and **\_\_exit\_\_** methods; the former simply returns the file object itself, and the latter closes the file:

>>> f = open("x.txt")

>>> f

<open file 'x.txt', mode 'r' at 0x00AE82F0>

>>> f.\_\_enter\_\_()

<open file 'x.txt', mode 'r' at 0x00AE82F0>

>>> f.read(1)

'X'

>>> f.\_\_exit\_\_(None, None, None)

>>> f.read(1)

Traceback (most recent call last):

File "<stdin>", line 1, in <module>

ValueError: I/O operation on closed file

so to open a file, process its contents, and make sure to close it, you can simply do:

with open("x.txt") as f:

data = f.read()

do something with data

This wasn’t very difficult, was it?