

---

Subject: Re: [RFC][PATCH 3/4]: Enable multiple mounts of /dev/pts  
Posted by [serue](#) on Wed, 06 Feb 2008 19:58:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Quoting Oren Laadan (orenl@cs.columbia.edu):

>

>

> Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

>> Quoting Oren Laadan (orenl@cs.columbia.edu):

>>>

>>> Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

>>>> Quoting Pavel Emelyanov (xemul@openvz.org):

>>>>> Serge E. Hallyn wrote:

>>>>>> Quoting Pavel Emelyanov (xemul@openvz.org):

>>>>>>> sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

>>>>>>> From: Sukadev Bhattiprolu <sukadev@us.ibm.com>

>>>>>>> Subject: [RFC][PATCH 3/4]: Enable multiple mounts of /dev/pts

>>> [SNIP]

>>>

>>>>>> That stuff becomes very very similar to that in proc :)

>>>>>> Makes sense to consolidate. Maybe...

>>>>>> Yeah, and the mqns that Cedric sent too. I think Cedric said he'd

>>>>>> started an a patch implementing a helper. Cedric?

>>>>> Mmm. I wanted to send one small objection to Cedric's patches with

>>>>> mqns,

>>>>> but the thread was abandoned by the time I decided to do-it-right-now.

>>>>>

>>>>> So I can put it here: forcing the CLONE\_NEWNS is not very good, since

>>>>> this makes impossible to push a bind mount inside a new namespace,

>>>>> which

>>>>> may operate in some chroot environment. But this ability is heavily

>>>> Which direction do you want to go? I'm wondering whether mounts

>>>> propagation can address it.

>>>> Though really, I think you're right - we shouldn't break the kernel

>>>> doing CLONE\_NEWMQ or CLONE\_NEWPTS without CLONE\_NEWNS, so we shouldn't

>>>> force the combination.

>>>>> exploited in OpenVZ, so if we can somehow avoid forcing the NEWNS flag

>>>>> that would be very very good :) See my next comment about this issue.

>>>>>

>>>>>> Pavel, not long ago you said you were starting to look at tty and pty

>>>>>> stuff - did you have any different ideas on devpts virtualization, or

>>>>>> are you ok with this minus your comments thus far?

>>>>> I have a similar idea of how to implement this, but I didn't thought

>>>>> about the details. As far as this issue is concerned, I see no reasons

>>>>> why we need a kern\_mount-ed devptsfs instance. If we don't make such,

>>>>> we may safely hold the ptsns from the superblock and be happy. The

>>>>> same seems applicable to the mqns, no?

>>>> But the current->nsproxy->devpts->mnt is used in several functions in

>>>> patch 3.  
>>>>> The reason I have the kern\_mount-ed instance of proc for pid namespaces  
>>>>> is that I need a vfsmount to flush task entries from, but allowing  
>>>>> it to be NULL (i.e. no kern\_mount, but optional user mounts) means  
>>>>> handing all the possible races, which is too heavy. But do we actually  
>>>>> need the vfsmount for devpts and mqns if no user-space mounts exist?  
>>>>>  
>>>>> Besides, I planned to include legacy ptys virtualization and console  
>>>>> virtualizatin in this namespace, but it seems, that it is not present  
>>>>> in this particular one.  
>>>> I had been thinking the consoles would have their own ns, since there's  
>>>> really nothing linking them, but there really is no good reason why  
>>>> userspace should ever want them separate. So I'm fine with combining  
>>>> them.  
>>> If you want to run something like an X server inside each container  
>>> (eg each container holds a desktop session of a different user), then  
>>> you need a separate virtual-console namespace for each container.  
>> Ok, but whether the consoles and devpts are unshared with the same  
>> cloneflag or not isn't an issue, right?  
>  
> true. (I misread your comment.)  
> (  
> modulo that we are additional-clone-flags-challenged ...)

Right, plus the fact that the number of clone flags involved becomes almost obscene. Let's see if Pavel and Suka have a preference, since one of them seems likely to end up coding it :)

>>> (yes, X per-se needs to provide remote display as opposed to use  
>>> local hardware; see <http://www.ncl.cs.columbia.edu/research/thinc/>)

Nice, by the way :)

>> -serge

thanks,  
-serge

---

Containers mailing list  
[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)  
<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---