

---

Subject: Re: [PATCH 0/3] clone64() and unshare64() system calls  
Posted by [hpa](#) on Thu, 10 Apr 2008 01:10:57 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

sukadev@us.ibm.com wrote:

>>

>> If you're going to make it a 64-bit pass it in as a 64-bit number, instead  
>> of breaking it into two numbers.

>

> Maybe I am missing your point. The glibc interface could take a 64bit  
> parameter, but don't we need to pass 32-bit values into the system call  
> on 32 bit systems ?

Not as such, no. The ABI handles that. To make the ABI clean on some architectures, it's good to consider a 64-bit value only in positions where they map to an even:odd register pair once slotted in.

> Yes, this was discussed before in the context of Pavel Emelyanov's patch

>

> <http://lkml.org/lkml/2008/1/16/109>

>

> along with sys\_indirect(). While there was no consensus, it looked like  
> adding a new system call was better than open ended interfaces.

That's not really an open-ended interface, it's just an expandable bitmap.

-hpa

---

Containers mailing list

[Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org](mailto:Containers@lists.linux-foundation.org)

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

---