
Subject: Re: [patch 05/10] Add "permit user submounts" flag to vfstmount
Posted by [Miklos Szeredi](#) on Tue, 17 Apr 2007 16:08:27 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

> > 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.

> 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.

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".

Miklos

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