

Re: question on anonymous type

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2008-06/msg00680.html>

- *From:* Jon Skeet [C# MVP] <skeet@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 6 Jun 2008 06:17:47 +0100
-

Arne Vajhøj <arne@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

If people ignore the C#-specific features of C# 3 just because they're not used to them, they'll be really missing out.

If the only think they miss out is stuff like this that has no functional impact, then they will survive.

I'm sure they'll survive – they just may not be as productive.

The problem with redundancy isn't the possibility for inconsistency – it's the lack of information density. It takes more space redundantly specifying information, so there's more to wade through when reading the code.

The possibility of inconsistency is the classic reason to avoid redundancy.

In many other scenarios, yes. Not here.

Disk space is cheap.

Who was arguing that disk space was relevant?

And I find it hard to believe that the usage of var instead of explicit classname should take longer time to read.

It changes the emphasis of the code. Eric Lippert puts it well:
<http://csharpindepth.com/ViewNote.aspx?NoteID=61>

Re: question on anonymous type

Jon Skeet - <skeet@xxxxxxxx>

Web site: <http://www.pobox.com/~skeet>

Blog: <http://www.msmvps.com/jon.skeet>

C# in Depth: <http://csharpindepth.com>

.