I'm proposing to add a new method Hash#values_at! that's basically a combination of #values_at and #fetch.

When dealing with configuration I prefer to use #fetch to fail early and this would be useful to read multiple keys at a time. An example (not strictly on a Hash, but you get the idea) could be:

```ruby
repo, token = ENV.values_at!("GITHUB_REPO", "GITHUB_TOKEN")
ENV.values_at!("INVALID")  # raises KeyError
```

```ruby
# not sure if that useful, but I provide it here for the sake of completeness
ENV.values_at!("SHELL", "INVALID")
# -> {"/bin/bash", "INVALID is missing"}
```

Another name for this could be #fetch_at, perhaps.

P.S. I'm attaching a patch that was done using mostly trial and error
hash.c (rb_hash_fetch_values): add Hash#fetch_values.
[Feature #10017] [Fix GH-776]

History

#1 - 07/09/2014 04:04 AM - shyouhei (Shyouhei Urabe)
fetch_at sounds much better than values_at! to me.

#2 - 07/09/2014 02:12 PM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)
- Description updated
+1 for fetch_at.

#3 - 07/09/2014 07:00 PM - wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)
- File fetch_at.patch added
I attached another patch calling this method fetch_at and I also added missing tests (I couldn't change issue title & body to reflect this changes, though).
Also, perhaps out of scope for this ticket but I'm wondering what're your thoughts about adding #fetch_at to ENV and Array too.

#4 - 07/09/2014 07:28 PM - avit (Andrew Vit)
Please consider the name fetch_at carefully: it seems easily confused with fetch (1 key), and the name doesn't hint that it's for multiple keys. (values_at is plural, so it gives a good clue.) Maybe fetch_values?

#5 - 07/24/2014 08:42 PM - wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)
Andrew Vit wrote:

Please consider the name fetch_at carefully: it seems easily confused with fetch (1 key), and the name doesn't hint that it's for multiple keys. (values_at is plural, so it gives a good clue.) Maybe fetch_values?

Personally, I prefer fetch_at but fetch_values (or fetch_values_at) is also good!

I'm curious what other core developers think.

#6 - 09/14/2014 10:23 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
For the reason Andrew pointed out, I also prefer #fetch_values. Maybe we need to conduct voting?

Matz.

#7 - 09/20/2014 03:23 AM - jihwans (Jihwan Song)
one vote for #values_at

#8 - 09/20/2014 08:15 AM - phluid61 (Matthew Kerwin)
-1 for values_at (this isn't a "I" method)
+0 for fetch_at (it's not clear that it isn't just an alias for #fetch)
+1 for fetch_values

#9 - 10/13/2014 10:10 AM - wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)
Should we get some more votes here, or should I just change my patch to use fetch_values?

#10 - 12/03/2014 09:49 PM - wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)
I submitted PR for this change: https://github.com/ruby/ruby/pull/776 calling the method fetch_values.

#11 - 02/02/2015 04:29 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)
- Status changed from Open to Assigned
- Assignee set to matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)

Matz, can we introduce this Hash#fetch_values?
Hi, please let me know if there's anything I can do to move this ticket forward.

#13 - 06/02/2015 09:42 PM - wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)
- Subject changed from Add `Hash#values_at!` to Add `Hash#fetch_values!`

#14 - 06/12/2015 07:17 AM - matz (Yukihiro Matsumoto)
#fetch_values approved.
Matz.

#15 - 06/12/2015 08:34 AM - nobu (Nobuyoshi Nakada)
- Status changed from Assigned to Closed

Applied in changeset r50845.

hash.c: fetch_values
- hash.c (rb_hash_fetch_values): add Hash#fetch_values.
  [Feature #10017] [Fix GH-776]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Files</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>values_at_bang.patch</td>
<td>1.53 KB</td>
<td>07/08/2014</td>
<td>wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fetch_at.patch</td>
<td>2.18 KB</td>
<td>07/09/2014</td>
<td>wojtekmach (Wojtek Mach)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>