## Subject: Re: [patch 05/10] Add "permit user submounts" flag to vfsmount Posted by serue on Tue, 17 Apr 2007 16:54:34 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

```
Quoting Miklos Szeredi (miklos@szeredi.hu):
>>> MNT_USER and MNT_USERMNT? I claim no way will people keep those
>>> straight. How about MNT_ALLOWUSER and MNT_USER?
>>> Umm, is "allowuser" more clear than "usermnt"? What is allowed to the
>> I think so, yes. One makes it clear that we're talking about allowing
>> user (somethings:), one might just as well mean "this is a user mount."
> >
>> user? "allowusermnt" may be more descriptive, but it's a bit too
>>> long.
> >
>> Yes, if it weren't too long it would by far have been my preference.
> > Maybe despite the length we should still go with it...
> >
>>> I don't think it matters all that much, the user will have to look up
>>> the semantics in the manpage anyway. Is "nosuid" descriptive? Not
>> very much, but we got used to it.
> > nosuid is quite clear.
> Is it? Shouldn't these be "allowsuid", "noallowsuid", "allowexec",
> "noallowexec"?
> See, we mentally add the "allow" quite easily.
```

But they aren't accompanied by a flag meaning "don't allow any non-nosuid mounts below this point". \*That\* is what causes the problem here.

- > > MNT\_USER and MNT\_USERMNT are so confusing that in the time I go from
- > > quitting the manpage to foregrounding my editor, I may have already
- > > forgotten which was which.

>

- > Well, to the user they are always in the form "user=123" and
- > "usermnt", so they are not as easy to confuse.

It still makes the kernel code harder to read, but for the user yes that is helpful.

- > But I feel a bit stupid bickering about this, because it isn't so
- > important. "allowuser" or "allowusermnt" are fine by me if you think
- > they are substantially better than "usermnt".

Thanks, I really really do :) -serge

Containers mailing list Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers