

Re: question on anonymous type

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/DotNet/microsoft.public.dotnet.languages.csharp/2008-06/msg00916.html>

- *From:* Jon Skeet [C# MVP] <skeet@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 8 Jun 2008 20:45:34 +0100
-

Arne Vajhøj <arne@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

In which case it would be interesting to see whether it becomes more requested in a few years' time, when those developers have been using C# 3 and become used to "var". It's too early to take results *now* and draw any conclusions.

True. It could change.

But I doubt it will happen. It is not exactly a new concept.

It's not a new *concept* but it may be new in *practice* to a lot of people. Heck, I'd never used a lambda expression in anger until C# 3, and those have been around for ages too.

I don't even think C# would have gotten it if it had not been for LINQ.

Quite possibly not – but that doesn't mean the feature isn't handy outside LINQ. Extension methods could be thought of in the same way, and those *are* on the cards for Java 7.

But if it's obvious when *reading* the code what's going on, the details only matter when you're looking more deeply into the code.

I don't consider the type a detail in OOP.

I do when it's a matter of skimming code. Do I care whether I'm using an array or a List<T> if I'm just indexing it? Not really. Do I care whether something is definitely a LinkedList<T> or any old IEnumerable<T> if all I'm doing is iterating over it? Not really.

Re: question on anonymous type

Bear in mind that the declared variable type won't tell you what the actual type is anyway (unless it's a sealed type) – if you need that information you've *got* to look to the right hand side of the assignment. If you're going to do that, how much do you care about the LHS?

I'm not saying it isn't important information – just that I don't find it important in certain modes of reading code, and those modes account for quite a lot of the time I may spend reading code (either for debugging and trying to get to the critical spot quickly, then understanding that critical spot in detail, or just getting the flavour of a class).

But hey, it's definitely a style thing. If you don't like it, that's fine.

I'm working on a problem, I don't actually need to read most of the code closely – I'll skim a lot of it. Implicitly typed local variables help the skimming mode, and arguably slightly harm the detailed part.

I believe many people will want to know the type even for skimming.

Then I believe they won't skim as quickly as they can, for the basic level of "what's this method trying to achieve?" that I aim for with skimming.

--

Jon Skeet – <skeet@xxxxxxxx>

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

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

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

.