

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/3] lutimesat: actual syscall and wire-up on i386  
Posted by [Ulrich Drepper](#) on Fri, 26 Jan 2007 20:45:20 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Andrew Morton wrote:

> OK, but I don't recall having seeing a demand for lutimes(). Opinions  
> are sought?

It's an interface which has been available on other platforms forever  
(lutimes, not lutimesat). If it can be implemented correctly on the  
interesting file systems I'd say "go ahead", it can only be useful and  
have more benefits than the probably small cost of implementing it.

If on the other hand important filesystems cannot support lutimes then  
I'd wait with introducing the syscall at least until the support is  
added. It much easier to cope with unavailable syscalls then it is with  
partially working ones.

--