

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 5/7]: Determine pts\_ns from a pty's inode.  
Posted by [Sukadev Bhattiprolu](#) on Wed, 26 Mar 2008 15:18:43 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Serge E. Hallyn [serue@us.ibm.com] wrote:

| Quoting sukadev@us.ibm.com (sukadev@us.ibm.com):

| > Serge E. Hallyn [serue@us.ibm.com] wrote:

| > | > | I suppose you could just create /dev/pts/ptmx and /dev/pts/tty.

| > | > | Recommend that in containers /dev/ptmx and /dev/tty be symlinks

| > | > | into /dev/pts. Applications don't need to change. If

| > | > | ptmx\_open() sees that inode->i\_sb is a devptsfs, it gets the

| > | > | namespace from the sb. If not, then it was a device in /dev

| > | > | and it gets the namespace from current.

| > | >

| > | > But we would still depend on user-space remounting /dev/pts after

| > | > the clone right ? Until they do that we would access the parent

| > | > container's /dev/pts/ptmx ?

| > |

| > | Yes. Which is the right thing to do imo.

| >

| > Hmm, that sounds reasonable, although slightly inconsistent with pid-ns,

| > where pid starts at 1 regardless of whether /proc is remounted.

|

| Very different cases. The pid is the task's pid in the new pidns.

| The task ALSO has a different pid in the parent pidns.

|

| The pts only has an identity in one ptsns.

|

| > But even so, if user fails to establish the symlink, clones the pts ns

| > and tries to create a pty, we would end up with different pts nses again ?

|

| Yes. So what?

We would end up allocating a pts index from child-pts-ns (i.e index 0)  
and attempt to open /dev/pts/0 which could be an existing pty in the  
parent pts ns ?

| > i.e

| > /dev/ptmx is still a char dev in root fs

| > clone(pts\_ns)

| > ( In child, (before remount /dev/pts))

| > open("/dev/ptmx")

| > open("/dev/pts/0")

| >

| > Since ptmx is not in devpts, we use current\_pts\_ns() or child-pts-ns

| > Since /dev/pts is not remounted in child, we get the parent pts-ns from

| >

| > If we can somehow detect the incorrect configuration and fail either

| > open, we should be ok :-)

|

| I completely disagree with this sentiment. The kernel doesn't need  
| to detect an "incorrect configuration" if it isn't dangerous. One  
| man's "incorrect configuration" is another man's useful trick.

Myabe configuration is the wrong word, but unless I am missing something  
above, spanning two pts-nses is an error condition ?

---

Containers mailing list

Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org

<https://lists.linux-foundation.org/mailman/listinfo/containers>

---