

## Ruby - Bug #6086

### Number of arguments and named parameters

02/25/2012 04:30 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)

<b>Status:</b>	Rejected		
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal		
<b>Assignee:</b>	matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)		
<b>Target version:</b>	2.0.0		
<b>ruby -v:</b>	r34800		
<b>Description</b>		<b>Backport:</b>	
While working on the messages of "wrong number of arguments" error (see <a href="#">#6085</a> ), I realized that the new named parameter feature can lead to misleading error messages:			
<pre>def foo(x: 42) end  arg = {x: :bar} foo(arg) # =&gt; nil (no error) arg = :bar foo(arg) # =&gt; ArgumentError: wrong number of arguments (1 for 0)</pre>			
It would be better if the wording was changed for methods accepting options. Maybe something like:			
<pre>foo(arg) # =&gt; ArgumentError: wrong number of arguments (1 for 0 **)</pre>			
Suggestions?			
<b>Related issues:</b>			
Related to Ruby - Bug #6085: Treatment of Wrong Number of Arguments		<b>Closed</b>	<b>02/25/2012</b>
Related to Ruby - Feature #5474: keyword argument		<b>Closed</b>	<b>10/23/2011</b>

### History

#### #1 - 03/11/2012 05:44 PM - ko1 (Koichi Sasada)

- Assignee set to mame (Yusuke Endoh)

#### #2 - 03/18/2012 06:46 PM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)

- Status changed from Open to Assigned

#### #3 - 04/24/2012 08:18 PM - mame (Yusuke Endoh)

- Assignee changed from mame (Yusuke Endoh) to matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

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](mailto:mame@tsg.ne.jp)

#### #4 - 07/14/2012 04:24 PM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

- Status changed from Assigned to Rejected

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.