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> What if we make the location of the locks a property of the index iteslf

> (meaning that it is stored in some file in the index directory)? If the

> index is trully read-only (as in a CD-ROM), we don't need locks at all

> and this property can be set to a special value indicating that index is

> read-only or that no locking should be used. Would this be the same as

> indicating that the index is process-safe?

I think having the lock be a proprty of the Directory interface makes

a whole lot more sense than using "lock files" as locks. Trying to

use lock files not only pushes more error-recovery responsibility to

the indexing code, but also imposes semantic requirements on how

Directory implementations handle file operations. Much more sensible

to make the Lock a distinguished property of the Directory interface

(like it has been) and let users elect which Directory to use (locking

FS-based, nonlocking FS-based, memory based, etc.)