

Ruby - Feature #16752

:private param for const_set

04/02/2020 05:56 PM - bughit (bug hit)

Status:	Open	
Priority:	Normal	
Assignee:		
Target version:		
Description Defining a private constant should not require two method calls. You want to encourage private declarations because they communicate intent better and are easier to refactor, two statements discourage it. Ideally there should be compact syntax for direct private declarations, but that's probably a difficult change. But const_set :FOO, 1, private: true or const_set :FOO, 1, :private should be trivial		
Related issues: Related to Ruby - Feature #17171: Why is the visibility of constants not affe... Rejected		

History

#1 - 04/02/2020 07:13 PM - sawa (Tsuyoshi Sawada)

To be precise, actually,

```
class A
  FOO = 1
  private_constant :FOO
end
```

is not two method calls; it is one assignment and one method call.

Besides that, I don't see that writing:

```
class A
  const_set :FOO, 1, private: true
end
```

is any more concise than writing:

```
class A
  FOO = 1; private_constant :FOO
end
```

#2 - 04/02/2020 07:28 PM - tannakartikey (Kartikey Tanna)

It might be a little helpful *only* if we are defining constants dynamically.

#3 - 04/03/2020 12:35 AM - shevegen (Robert A. Heiler)

I somewhat agree with sawa here.

This may still leave the issue over whether one may prefer a single line/method call, but I believe this may largely depend on the use case more (if there is one). I can understand it to some extent if a ruby user may wish to avoid using the ";", I sometimes want to avoid ";" too. In these cases, I typically do as sawa pointed out, and just use a new line. :)

But I don't have any really strong preferences here either way, also because I do not think I have actually used private_constant so far (did not seem to be necessary for me). I did, however had, have lots of use cases in the past for const_set() (or whatever the name was for setting a constant for a particular "namespace" ... I always mix it up with set_const() which I think does not exist :P), and also removing this. There are quite many use cases for the latter, more than for private*, I think. But your mileage may vary.

#4 - 09/15/2020 08:50 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)

- *Related to Feature #17171: Why is the visibility of constants not affected by `private`? added*