# Ruby - Feature #6672

# Calling #() without dot before braces

06/30/2012 07:13 AM - prijutme4ty (Ilya Vorontsov)

<b>•</b> • •				
Status:	Rejected			
Priority:	Normal			
Assignee:				
Target version:				
Description				
=begin It looks odd to call Proc/Method (({pr})) using (({pr.(*args)})) or (({pr[*args]})) syntax. Why not to use (({pr(*args)})) syntax? In such a case methods(procs) would become nearer to first-class object and calls are more standardized such that there's much less difference between method call and call of (({#call})) method				
So I suggest syntax (({x.(*args,█)})) alias to (({x(*args,█)})) It will make it possible to transparently redefine any method in a scope like this: class String def my_meth(direction) index = method :rindex if direction == 'RtoL'				
lots of code that uses #index method				
end				
<pre>def my_second_met: upcase = method s method and addee</pre>	n :downcase  # we decided to try n d such a line	what if we change all	upcases	to downcases in thi
lots of code using upcase() method				
upcase()  # it's sad that it's impossible not to use brackets at all, but this'd be ambiguous end				
end				
Also I wrote about syntax like (({:meth.(*args)})) which creates a proxy-object having to_proc method - so that it's possible to write (({[1,2,3].map &:to_s.(2)})) now no dot in such syntax				
Also it'd be possible to implement some object with syntax like (({obj(args1)(args2)})) - obj has method (({#call})) that returns object that also has method (({#call})) and they are both called. It can be in such a way: (({method(:index)('z')}))				
One problem is that it c it works in such a way: p='var':	an behave differently from current behavior	in case that method have th	e same nar	ne as a local-variable. Now
print p #=> 'var' ## wor p('hi') #=> 'hi' ## works	ks as local variable s as method call			
I don't know if it's a spec, I suppose that one mustn't use both variable and method at the same place. So even it's a spec it can be revised in future versions of ruby so that new behaviour would be like that: p='var';				
p('hi') #=> var ## Wor p('hi') #=> undefined me =end	ethod call for 'var':String			
Related issues:				
Is duplicate of Ruby - Feat	ure #7346: object() as syntax sugar for object	. Re	ejected	11/13/2012

### History

#1 - 06/30/2012 08:04 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)

#### - Description updated

FYI, this is a feature which had been implemented once and reverted in the past.

I don't know if it's a spec, I suppose that one mustn't use both variable and method at the same place. So even it's a spec it can be revised in future versions of ruby so that new behaviour would be like that:

Yes, it's a spec, and there was so many code depending this, more than expected before the try.

#### #2 - 06/30/2012 09:10 AM - prijutme4ty (Ilya Vorontsov)

nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada) wrote:

- FYI, this is a feature which had been implemented once and reverted in the past.
  - I don't know if it's a spec, I suppose that one mustn't use both variable and method at the same place. So even it's a spec it can be revised in future versions of ruby so that new behaviour would be like that:

Yes, it's a spec, and there was so many code depending this, more than expected before the try.

Sadly. It looks that code basing on such a spec isn't written in a good manner =\

#### #3 - 11/18/2012 12:37 PM - Anonymous

In that case this issue should be closed. (I also think this feature is too much sugar.)

### #4 - 11/19/2012 12:26 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

- Status changed from Open to Rejected