While working on the messages of "wrong number of arguments" error (see #6085), I realized that the new named parameter feature can lead to misleading error messages:

```ruby
def foo(x: 42)
end

arg = {x: :bar}
foo(arg) # => nil (no error)
arg = :bar
foo(arg) # => ArgumentError: wrong number of arguments (1 for 0)
```

It would be better if the wording was changed for methods accepting options. Maybe something like:

```ruby
foo(arg) # => ArgumentError: wrong number of arguments (1 for 0 **)
```

Suggestions?

Matz, what do you think?

I'm not against this. But I'm not sure how surprising this behavior is, until I encounter it in actual use case.

"(1 for 0 **)" is not very good-looking, but I have no alternative idea.

--
Yusuke Endoh mame@tsg.ne.jp

Even though I understand the point, I am against the expression "(1 for 0 **)". So until some one come up with better expression, we leave this as it is now.

Matz.