

---

Subject: Re: Multiple instances of devpts  
Posted by [ebiederm](#) on Sat, 12 Apr 2008 19:15:57 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

On Sat, 2008-04-12 at 11:54 -0700, H. Peter Anvin wrote:

> Al Viro wrote:

> >

> > 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.

Agreed. That is another legitimate path. And if all you care about is isolation and not dealing with the general class of problems with the global device number to device mapping that is sane. I know we have several other virtual devices that we tend to care about but ptys are the real world pain point.

Further I don't see any conflict with the generalizing devpts in this manner (so you only see a subset of the ptys) and then later adding a namespace that deals with the whole device number to device mapping.

Eric

---

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

---