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**Description**

In #15865, a new syntax `<expr> in <pattern>` was introduced. By using this, we can write:

```ruby
json = { foo: 1, bar: 2 }
if json in { foo:, bar: }
  p [foo, bar] #=> [1, 2]
end
```

However, we cannot write:

```ruby
p(json in { foo:, bar: }) #=> expected: true, actual: syntax error
```

This is because `<expr> in <pattern>` is an expression but not an argument. For example, foo(json in a, b, c) is ambiguous: it is considered foo((json in a), b, c) and foo((json in a, b, c)).

What should we do?

1. Do nothing; we admit that it is a spec
2. Revert the feature
3. Disallow a pattern like a, b, c or a:, b:, c: in this one-line pattern matching syntax; we ask a user to write `json in [a, b, c]` or `json in {a:, b:, c:}`

**Related issues:**

Related to Ruby master - Feature #15865: `<expr> in <pattern>` expression

**Associated revisions**

Revision 6e70fa49 - 11/10/2019 01:34 PM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
Disallow omission of parentheses/brackets in single line pattern matching [Feature #16182]

Revision ecb6d6a4 - 08/19/2021 08:07 AM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
Allow omission of parentheses in one line pattern matching [Feature #16182]

**History**

#1 - 10/01/2019 01:36 PM - shevegen (Robert A. Heiler)
I can not comment/answer on the issue and questions; I think this is for matz and the core team to decide either way, whatever the way.

I did, however had, want to add that:

```ruby
json in [a:, b:, c:]
```

is quite difficult to read (for me). So even if this may not be an ideal explanation, but ... I would not be at all opposed to disallowing that, merely syntax-wise alone. :-(

(I do not really have a big opinion on the functionality in general but ideally my personal taste is to prefer simpler syntax, whenever that is possible. We have in general quite some suggestions that combine a lot of complex syntax together, which I think is not ideal, in general; also in other proposals.)

#2 - 10/02/2019 03:24 AM - baweaver (Brandon Weaver)
I wonder if it would make sense to reverse this to be left-to-right (LTR) rather than right-to-left (RTL) to make it easier to parse.
I cannot think of another RTL syntax in Ruby at the moment, including the current for ... in statement:

```ruby
for item in collection
end
```

A full example might be:

```ruby
for a, b in { a: 1, b: 2 }
p a, b
end
:a
:b
=> {:a=>1, :b=>2}
```

Of course this does not currently work with keyword arguments:

```ruby
[2] pry(main)> for a: 1, b: 2 in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2 }]
SyntaxError: unexpected ':', expecting '.' or & or :: or '['
for a: 1, b: 2 in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2...^

[2] pry(main)> for a:, b: in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2 }]
SyntaxError: unexpected tSYMBEG, expecting do or '}' or '{'
for a:, b: in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2 }]
```

What if we leveraged some of the current logic for parsing a for ... in statement to make single-line pattern matching into a LTR syntax? This may be a solution for the parsing difficulties, as well as build on the intuition of Ruby developers expecting LTR syntaxes naturally.

#3 - 10/02/2019 08:05 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
I vote for 3 in the OP.

Matz.

#4 - 11/10/2019 01:39 PM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
- Status changed from Open to Closed

Applied in changeset git|6e70fa49b111e2a839297b057a3df354cae265a.

Disallow omission of parentheses/brackets in single line pattern matching [Feature #16182]

#5 - 11/10/2019 01:40 PM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
- Status changed from Closed to Open

#6 - 11/10/2019 01:41 PM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
- Related to Feature #15865: `<expr> in <pattern>` expression added

#7 - 08/15/2021 11:53 AM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
How about allowing brackets/braces to be omitted in one-line pattern matching?
Now that we use => in one-line pattern matching, that syntax can't be made into an argument whether we allow omission or not.

#8 - 08/19/2021 07:32 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
I agree with allowing to omit parentheses in the pattern.

Matz.

#9 - 08/19/2021 08:11 AM - ktsj (Kazuki Tsujimoto)
- Status changed from Open to Closed

Applied in changeset git|ecb6d6a4ef058b5598a7633c3921eeab08ce11c6.

Allow omission of parentheses in one line pattern matching [Feature #16182]