

---

Subject: Re: [RFC PATCH 0/2] net: connect to UNIX sockets from specified root  
Posted by [hpa](#) on Fri, 10 Aug 2012 18:31:25 GMT

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

---

On 08/10/2012 11:26 AM, Alan Cox wrote:

>> On that whole subject...

>>

>> Do we need a Unix domain socket equivalent to `openat()`?

>

> I don't think so. The name is just a file system indexing trick, it's not  
> really the socket proper. It's little more than "ascii string with  
> permissions attached" - indeed we also support an abstract name space  
> which for a lot of uses is actually more convenient.

>

I don't really understand why Unix domain sockets is different than any other pathname users in this sense. (Actually, I have never understood why `open()` on a Unix domain socket doesn't give the equivalent of a `socket() + connect()` -- it would make logical sense and would provide additional functionality).

It would be different if the Unix domain sockets simply required an absolute pathname (it is not just about the root, it is also about the cwd, which is where the `-at()` functions come into play), but that is not the case.

The abstract namespace is irrelevant for this, obviously.

> `AF_UNIX` between roots raises some interesting semantic questions when  
> you begin passing file descriptors down them as well.

Why is that? A file descriptor carries all that information with it...

-hpa

---