Ruby master - Feature #2172
Enumerable#chunk with no block
10/03/2009 01:48 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafoutine)

Status: Closed
Priority: Normal
Assignee: matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
Target version: 

Description
=begin
What should "(1..3).chunk" (i.e. without a block) do?
It issued an ArgumentError: tried to create Proc object without a block
I changed the error message to "no block given" which I hope to be more informative, but maybe there is something more useful to do here?
A default block of \{|x| x\} doesn't seem all that useful.
Returning an enumerator that, upon completion, will return an enumerator would probably be better, but could also be a bit confusing if someone doesn't realize he forgot to specify the block?
Thanks to Run Paint for raising the question when writing the rubyspec for #chunk.
=end

Associated revisions
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History
#1 - 10/16/2009 10:04 AM - naruse (Yui NARUSE)
- Status changed from Open to Assigned
- Assignee changed from matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto) to akr (Akira Tanaka)

#2 - 11/04/2009 12:25 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafoutine)
- Category set to core
- Assignee changed from akr (Akira Tanaka) to matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
- Target version set to 1.9.2

#3 - 11/04/2009 12:29 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafoutine)
- Assignee changed from matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto) to akr (Akira Tanaka)

#4 - 03/25/2010 11:54 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
Maybe a default block of \(|x| x\) can be useful for some people...

#5 - 04/04/2010 01:22 AM - znz (Kazuhiro NISHIYAMA)
- Target version changed from 1.9.2 to 2.0.0

#6 - 08/06/2012 10:35 PM - tokland (Arnau Sanchez)
Any decision about this? For me it's a clear +1, chunking by the values unchanged is very common (not that it's representative, but I checked my code: 4 occurrences of chunk, all with the identity block)

#7 - 10/28/2012 11:05 PM - akr (Akira Tanaka)
- Description updated
- Target version changed from 2.0.0 to 2.6

#8 - 09/21/2016 02:53 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
- Assignee changed from akr (Akira Tanaka) to matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
Matz, would you agree to return enumerator for chunk without a block?
This is useful in particular to chain it with with_index
A real case example is to summarize a list of integers into ranges. Currently, we need:

```ruby
integers.enum_for(&:chunk).with_index { |x, idx| x - idx }.map do |diff, group|
  [group.first, group.last]
end
```

#9 - 09/21/2016 02:55 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
Forgot to note that the other possibility suggested for chunk with no block can now be done clearly and succinctly with chunk(&itself), so there's no longer any doubt that the block without block should return an Enumerator

#10 - 10/04/2016 10:28 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
Now it sounds reasonable. Marc-Andre, could you implement it?
Matz.

#11 - 10/04/2016 06:30 PM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
Great, thanks!
Done for chunk.
Matz, I imagine I should do the same for chunk_while, slice_after, slice_before and slice_when, right?

#12 - 10/06/2016 04:45 AM - marcandre (Marc-Andre Lafortune)
- Status changed from Assigned to Closed
Closing, created #12813 instead.