
Subject: Re: Suggest Xmlize support for Value
Posted by [Mindtraveller](#) on Wed, 28 May 2008 19:51:57 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Because it handles with hierarchical config data very conveniently. You should not write your own binary containers. Moreover, data could be partially binary and partially textual. I heavily use this feature i.e. for saving library of objects with dynamic properties. This means I don't know types of each property at compile time, as user may add properties of any common type. This looks like rather common task and Xmlize works great for this (I even stopped writing my own XmlProperties class when implemented Value support for Xmlize).

Binding to binary format looks like a serious problem. But do we really do it? What we do is writing the same data output we have for all the types but in "textual" format. We could have the same output on all the platforms. The same bytes. My method simply emulates reading binary bytes. The same bytes you would read by using "direct" method. This is as far as I understand, maybe it's not that simple though.
