

---

Subject: Multiple instances of devpts

Posted by [hpa](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2008 18:54:59 GMT

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

---

Al Viro wrote:

>  
> \*boggle\*  
>  
> Care to explain how that "namespace" is different from devpts instance?  
> IOW, why the devil do you guys ignore Occam's Razor?  
>  
> Frankly, this nonsense has gone far enough; I can buy the need to compensate  
> for shitty APIs (sockets, non-fs-based-IPC, etc.), but devpts \*is\* \*a\*  
> \*fucking\* \*filesystem\*. Already. And as such it's already present in  
> normal, real, we-really-shouldn't-have-any-other-if-not-for-ancient-stupidity  
> namespace.  
>  
> Why not simply allow independent instances of devpts and be done with that?

In particular:

/dev/ptmx can be a symlink ptmx -> pts/ptmx, and we add a ptmx instance inside the devpts filesystem. Each devpts filesystem is responsible for its own pool of ptys, with own numbering, etc.

This does mean that entries in /dev/pts are more than just plain device nodes, which they are now (you can cp -a a device node from /dev/pts into another filesystem and it will still "just work"), but I doubt this actually matters to anyone. If anyone cares, now I guess would be a good time to speak up.

-hpa

---

Containers mailing list

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

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

---