
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.

--