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**Description**

In [#15865](#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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**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 cannot 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
2
=> {:a=>1, :b=>2}
```

Of course this does not currently work with keyword arguments:

1. ```ruby
   pry(main)> for a:, b: in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2 }]
   SyntaxError: unexpected ':', expecting '.' or &. or :: or ']
   for a:, b: in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2... ^
   pry(main)> for a:, b: in [{ a: 1 }, { b: 2 }]
   SyntaxError: unexpected tSYMBEGIN, 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|6e70fa49b111e2a2839297b057a3df354cae265a.

---

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|e6b6a4ef058b5598a7633c3921eeab08ce11c6.

---

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