Subject: Re: [PATCH 3/3] lutimesat: actual syscall and wire-up on i386
Posted by adobriyan on Mon, 29 Jan 2007 10:59:40 GMT

On Fri, Jan 26, 2007 at 12:45:20PM -0800, Ulrich Drepper wrote:
> 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.

What do you mean by "filesystems cannot support lutimes"? Filesystems
that don't have on-disk timestamps for symlinks?