

## Base Language - Bug #7198

### conversion of empty UPDATE/SET/PROMPT-FOR statements

03/15/2023 11:39 AM - Constantin Asofiei

<b>Status:</b>	Test	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>	Constantin Asofiei	<b>% Done:</b>	0%
<b>Category:</b>		<b>Estimated time:</b>	0.00 hour
<b>Target version:</b>		<b>case_num:</b>	
<b>billable:</b>	No	<b>version:</b>	
<b>vendor_id:</b>	GCD		
<b>Description</b>			

#### History

##### #2 - 03/15/2023 11:42 AM - Constantin Asofiei

Empty UPDATE., SET. or PROMPT-FOR. statements seem to be a no-op in OE. FWD fails at conversion phase.

Test UPDATE/SET/PROMPT-FOR WITH FRAME cases, without any referenced widgets. With and without an existing frame with defined widgets.

##### #3 - 03/15/2023 12:40 PM - Constantin Asofiei

- Status changed from New to WIP

- Assignee set to Constantin Asofiei

Created task branch 7198a from trunk rev 14506.

7198a/14507 fixes this for UPDATE/SET/PROMPT-FOR. We need to test ENABLE and other statements, in the same way. The test used was:

```
def var ch as char.  
update.  
update with frame f1.  
update ch.  
update ch with frame f1.  
  
set.  
set with frame f1.  
set ch.  
set ch with frame f1.  
  
prompt-for.  
prompt-for with frame f1.  
prompt-for ch.  
prompt-for ch with frame f1.
```

In OE, a test like this:

```
def var ch as char.  
update with frame f1 title "x".  
message "x".  
pause.  
update ch with frame f1.
```

goes directly to the PAUSE. statement - so it doesn't look like UPDATE gets morphed into a VIEW.

**#4 - 03/15/2023 12:53 PM - Greg Shah**

I thought we already handled this at one point.

**#5 - 03/15/2023 01:38 PM - Constantin Asofiei**

Greg Shah wrote:

I thought we already handled this at one point.

I thought so, too, but the only thing I found was empty DISPLAY morphing into VIEW, for #3389.

**#6 - 03/21/2023 11:36 AM - Greg Shah**

Do you want to put this into 7199a instead?

Should we set this to Review?

**#7 - 03/21/2023 11:43 AM - Constantin Asofiei**

Greg Shah wrote:

Do you want to put this into 7199a instead?

No.

Should we set this to Review?

There is more work for ENABLE and any other UI statements. Plus I don't know what happens if there are DO WITH FRAME F: UPDATE. END., which is not using the implicit unnamed frame.

**#8 - 06/02/2023 09:57 AM - Greg Shah**

There is more work for ENABLE and any other UI statements. Plus I don't know what happens if there are DO WITH FRAME F: UPDATE. END., which is not using the implicit unnamed frame.

Should we defer the rest of these checks to another task and move ahead with 7198a?

**#9 - 06/02/2023 10:00 AM - Constantin Asofiei**

Greg Shah wrote:

There is more work for ENABLE and any other UI statements. Plus I don't know what happens if there are DO WITH FRAME F: UPDATE.  
END., which is not using the implicit unnamed frame.

Should we defer the rest of these checks to another task and move ahead with 7198a?

Yes, I think so. But I need to put this (and 7199c) into conversion testing.

**#10 - 06/02/2023 11:22 AM - Constantin Asofiei**

7198a rev 14507 was rebased from trunk rev 14604 - new rev 14605.

rev 14606 has an adjustment for new downPath(tokenlist) version.

**#11 - 06/05/2023 08:10 AM - Greg Shah**

You can merge 7198a to trunk after 7395d.

**#12 - 06/05/2023 10:15 AM - Constantin Asofiei**

Branch 7198a was merged to trunk rev 14609 and archived.

**#13 - 06/05/2023 10:20 AM - Greg Shah**

- Status changed from WIP to Test