Stack Overflow requires external JavaScript from another domain, which is blocked or failed to load.

## Learn, Share, Build

Each month, over 50 million developers come to Stack Overflow to learn, share their knowledge, and build their careers.





## Where are the constructor and destructor attribute directives for Clang documented?



Function attributes for C and C++ for running code before and after main() work with the Clang compiler. The following code:

```
#include <stdio.h>

void constr() __attribute((constructor));
void destr() __attribute((destructor));

int main(){
    printf("foo\n");
    return 0;
}

void constr(){
    printf("bar\n");
```

Stack Overflow requires external JavaScript from another domain, which is blocked or failed to load.

```
void destr(){
    printf("baz\n");
}
```

Works as expected:

```
clang++ const_dest.cpp -o const_dest; ./const_dest
```

## Outputs:

bar foo

baz

However, unlike GCC, I can't find such a description in the official documentation. This page lists numerous attributes, but constructor and destructor are not among them. A google search of

```
"__attribute__ ((constructor))" site:llvm.org
```

(note the quotes) yields no result.

So, is this feature of Clang documented, and if not, why not? Seems a pretty strange omission, especially since a page listing many other attributes exists.

```
c++ c attributes documentation clang
```

asked Mar 21 at 21:44



executor21

**3,173** 5 21 32

## 1 Answer

The Clang documentation page you linked to says

This page lists the attributes currently supported by Clang.

Stack Overflow requires external JavaScript from another domain, which is blocked or failed to load. currently supported by the documented version (5) or Clang than as asserting that it documents only some of them.

You ask

So, is this feature of Clang documented, and if not, why not? Seems a pretty strange omission, especially since a page listing many other attributes exists.

Either the attributes you asked about are *not* supported by Clang 5, or the documentation is faulty. I would believe either, or even both. Note, however, that "supported" is not necessarily the same thing as "recognized" or "accepted" or even "implemented". It may be that Clang accepts them but does nothing with them, or that it in fact implements them consistently with GCC, but does not support their use. One could even interpret "supported" in that context to mean "documented on this page."

answered Mar 21 at 21:54

