Subject: Re: [PATCH 1/3] lutimesat: simplify utime(2)
Posted by Alexey Dobriyan on Sun, 28 Jan 2007 15:28:42 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

On Sat, Jan 27, 2007 at 12:35:42AM +0100, Arnd Bergmann wrote:
> On Friday 26 January 2007 21:41, Andrew Morton wrote:

>
> http://www.opengroup.org/onlinepubs/000095399/functions/utim es.html
> lists a slight difference between utime and utimes in the handling
> of EPERM/EACCESS:
>
> > The utimes() function shall fail if:
> > [EACCES] 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:
> > [EACCES] 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.

Present sys_utime() and do_utimes() are identical, except the former
does direct getusering into new attributes, and the latter accept "int
dfd" instead of hardcoded current working directory.