## Proposal

Post = Struct.new(:id, :name)

# In addition to this,
Post.new(1, "hello") #=> #<struct Post id=1, name="hello">

# Let the following initialization also work
Post.new(id: 1, name: "hello") #=> #<struct Post id=1, name="hello">

### Known incompatibility

- Post.new(id: 1, name: "hello") will be #<struct Post id=1, name="hello"> instead of #<struct Post id=1, name="hello">, name=nil>
  - Struct initialization only using keyword arguments should be warned in Ruby 3.0. **This feature should be introduced in Ruby 3.1 or later.**

### Edge cases

- When keyword arguments and positional arguments are mixed: Post.new(1, name: "hello")
  - This should continue to work like Ruby 2: #<struct Post id=1, name="hello">  
  - Only keywords are given but they include an invalid member: Post.new(fooo: "bar")
    - ArgumentError (unknown keywords: foo)
  - When keyword_init is used
    - true: Require keyword init, disallow positional init.
    - false: Treat keywords as positional hash.

### Use cases

- Simplify a struct definition where [Feature #11925](https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/11925) is used.
  - When we introduced [Feature #11925](https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/11925), name (Yusuke Endoh) thought we don't need keyword_init: true once keyword args are separated (https://docs.google.com/document/d/1XbUbch8_eTqh21FOwj9a_X-ZyJyCBjxq8rWwtp5BM/edit#). That's what this ticket is all about.
  - However, the keyword arguments separation was done differently from what we expected at the moment. So we need to deal with the "Known incompatibility".
  - Matz objected to having a new keyword argument (immutable: true) in Struct.new at https://bugs.ruby-lang.org/issues/16769#note-8. So keyword_init: true seems also against Ruby’s design. Now we should be able to skip specifying the option for consistency in the language design.

### Related issues:

- Related to Ruby master - Feature #11925: Struct construction with kwargs

### Associated revisions

**Revision 8d099aa0 - 01/17/2021 09:35 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)**

Warn Struct#initialize with only keyword args (#4070)

- Warn Struct#initialize with only keyword args

A part of [Feature #16806]
Do not warn if keyword_init: false is explicitly specified.

- Add a NEWS entry
- s/in/from/
- Make sure all fields are initialized

Revision fbb3cab9 - 01/29/2022 08:32 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)

Add a NEWS entry about [Feature #16806]

History

#1 - 04/22/2020 06:23 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
- Related to Feature #11925: Struct construction with kwargs added

#2 - 04/22/2020 06:29 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
- Description updated

#3 - 04/22/2020 02:57 PM - jeremyevans0 (Jeremy Evans)

I'm OK with the basic idea of allowing keyword init for Structs by default. However, because this changes behavior, I think we should keep existing behavior and warn in Ruby 3.0 and not make this change until Ruby 3.1. I think this change should only affect cases where keywords are passed without positional arguments during Struct initialization.

For Post.new(foo: "bar"), this should still be treated as keyword init, even though foo is not a member of Post. In Ruby 3.0, that would warn and use {foo=>"bar"} as the first member of Post. In Ruby 3.1, that would raise ArgumentError, since foo is not a member of Post and the keywords will be treated as named members.

For Post.new(1, foo: "bar"), Post.new(1, name: "hello"), Post.new(1, id: 1): I think these should be treated the same as Ruby 2. Any non-keyword argument should treat keywords as a positional hash argument. I think allowing mixing of the arguments would result in confusion, brings up additional edge cases, and there is no practical use case for it.

Do we want to support Post = Struct.new(:id, :name, keyword_init: false) to disallow keyword initialization and always treat keywords as a positional hash? I think we should as that is the intent of the code. Basically, keyword_init would allow 3 values:

- true: Require keyword init, disallow positional init.
- false: Treat keywords as positional hash.

#4 - 04/23/2020 06:10 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
- Description updated

I agreed with your ideas and reflected them to the description.

#5 - 01/13/2021 06:30 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
I am OK with 3.1 to warn, 3.2 to change.

Matz.

#6 - 01/17/2021 09:36 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
- Status changed from Open to Closed

Applied in changeset gil80d099aa040427aeed04e42c3ac9380af431ffe3.

Warn Struct#initialize with only keyword args (#4070)

- Warn Struct#initialize with only keyword args

A part of [Feature #16806]

- Do not warn if keyword_init: false
is explicitly specified

- Add a NEWS entry
- s/in/from/
- Make sure all fields are initialized

#7 - 01/19/2021 12:05 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
  - Assignee set to k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
  - Status changed from Closed to Assigned

#8 - 01/29/2022 08:29 AM - k0kubun (Takashi Kokubun)
  - Status changed from Assigned to Closed

nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada) already committed the last step at c956f979e5d05900315d2753d5c3b1389af8dae4. Closing.