
Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/3] lutimesat: simplify utime(2)
Posted by [Arnd Bergmann](#) on Fri, 26 Jan 2007 23:35:42 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

On Friday 26 January 2007 21:41, Andrew Morton wrote:

<http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/000095399/functions/utimes.html>
lists a slight difference between utime and utimes in the handling
of EPERM/EACCESS:

- > The utimes() function shall fail if:
- > [EACCESS] Search permission is denied by a component of the path prefix;
- > or the times argument is a null pointer and the effective user ID of the
- > process does not match the owner of the file and write access is denied.
- > [EPERM] The times argument is not a null pointer and the calling process'
- > effective user ID has write access to the file but does not match the
- > owner of the file and the calling process does not have the appropriate
- > privileges.
- >
- > The utime() function shall fail if:
- > [EACCESS] Search permission is denied by a component of the path prefix;
- > or the times argument is a null pointer and the effective user ID of the
- > process does not match the owner of the file, the process does not have
- > write permission for the file, and the process does not have appropriate
- > privileges.
- > [EPERM] The times argument is not a null pointer and the calling process'
- > effective user ID does not match the owner of the file and the calling
- > process does not have the appropriate privileges.

I don't really understand how that should be implemented in different
ways, but it might be the reason that we have separate functions.

Arnd <><
