Subject: Re: [patch 05/10] Add "permit user submounts" flag to vfsmount
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