

Database - Bug #6310

for first "first()", exclusive-lock, raises FWD exception while 4GL raises at the field assign

05/03/2022 08:55 AM - Tijs Wickardt

| | | | |
|------------------------|--------|------------------------|-----------|
| Status: | New | Start date: | |
| Priority: | Normal | Due date: | |
| Assignee: | | % Done: | 0% |
| Category: | | Estimated time: | 0.00 hour |
| Target version: | | case_num: | |
| billable: | No | version: | |
| vendor_id: | GCD | | |
| Description | | | |

History

#1 - 05/03/2022 08:56 AM - Tijs Wickardt

Greg Shah wrote:

In regard to the unrelated issues, make a list and post them here. We will move them to another task, but some of them may already be known so I want to help "sort them" first.

Unrelated issues:

```
. From: testcases/toplevel_trans/tests/ip_dynamic_field_update.p
```

```
procedure ip_shouldfail:
```

```
for first customer exclusive-lock:  
  buffer customer::customerName = "ip_shouldfail":U + cGuid no-error.  
  if error-status:get-number(1) <> 7369 then  
    undo, throw new Progress.Lang.AppError(  
      "
```

```
UNEXPECTED: The following should have been raised: 'Update of buffer field object requires a transaction. (736  
9) "',  
  9992882).  
end.
```

```
&if defined(FWD-VERSION) > 0 &then  
/* Workaround for unrelated FWD exceptional flow mishap (at the find exclusive -> buf.first() in FWD) */  
/* Sadly, even this workaround does not fire. To be investigated. */  
catch e as Progress.Lang.Error:  
  if e:GetMessageNum(1) <> 7369 then  
    undo, throw new Progress.Lang.AppError(  
      "
```

```
UNEXPECTED: The following should have been raised: 'Update of buffer field object requires a transaction. (736  
9) "',  
  9992883).  
end catch.  
&endif  
end procedure.
```

1. The .first() exclusive causes a raise in FWD, not in the originating for first in OE (where the silent error will happen at the assign)
2. Therefore I cannot check the no-error at the assign for error no 7369
3. The raised exception does not enter a FWD catch block for this (sub)scenario

#3 - 05/03/2022 09:23 AM - Tijds Wickardt

Greg Shah wrote:

Please create a bug in the Database project for this issue. We will focus on item 1 and then see what is still open.