

## 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 #106

**Topic:** mailx and quoting ambiguity **Relevant Clauses:** 4.40.7.2

POSIX.2 says in 4.40.7.2 “- An argument can be enclosed between paired double-quotes (“”) or single-quotes (‘ ’); any white space, shell word expansion or backslash characters within the quotes will be treated literally as part of the argument. A double- quote will be treated literally within single- quotes and vice versa. ” It then says that File names, where expected, shall be subjected to the process of shell word expansions.... My reading of this (and confirmed by historical implementations) is that the arguments are parsed, and mailx does not interpret the contents of an argument quoted by “or “. Then, if the argument to the command specifies a filename; the argument is subjected to the process of shell word expansion. This allows the use of commands such as ? write “\$((1 + 3))” # uses filename “4” ? save “\$(date +%A)” # used filename e.g. “Tuesday” Is this interpretation correct?

### Interpretation Response

The standard is unclear on this issue, and no conformance distinction can be made between alternative implementations based on this. This is being referred to the sponsor.

### Rationale for Interpretation

None.