

IEEE Standards Interpretations for IEEE Std 1003.2™-1992 IEEE Standard for Information Technology--Portable Operating System Interfaces (POSIX®)--Part 2: Shell and Utilities

Copyright © 1996 by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. 3 Park Avenue New York, New York 10016-5997 USA All Rights Reserved.

Interpretations are issued to explain and clarify the intent of a standard and **do not** constitute an alteration to the original standard. In addition, interpretations are not intended to supply consulting information. Permission is hereby granted to download and print one copy of this document. Individuals seeking permission to reproduce and/or distribute this document in its entirety or portions of this document must contact the IEEE Standards Department for the appropriate license. Use of the information contained in this document is at your own risk.

IEEE Standards Department, Copyrights and Permissions, 445 Hoes Lane, Piscataway, New Jersey 08855-1331, USA

Interpretation Request #114

Topic: mailx default command **Relevant Clauses:** 4.40.7

In subclause 4.40.7, the Extended Description of the mailx command, (P342, L6328-L6330), it says: Regular commands are of the form [command] [msglist] [argument...] If not command is specified in command mode, print shall be assumed... While this language is clear, and corresponds well with the language in the SVID (mailx-(au_cmd, p 6-44)), the actual historical behavior of this command should be expressed as follows: Regular commands are of the form [command] [msglist] [argument...] If not command is specified in command mode, next shall be assumed... I believe that this variance from actual historic practice was not intended. The rationale for mailx seems to carefully point out the cases where the standard differs from historic practice, but does not mention this issue.

Interpretation Response

The standard states the behavior for the form of regular commands in mailx, and conforming implementations must conform to this. However, concerns have been raised about this which are being referred to the sponsor.

Rationale for Interpretation

None.