

## Database - Bug #8200

### Explicit buffer used instead of the implicit one for a persistent table

01/16/2024 07:53 AM - Andrei Bălteanu

<b>Status:</b>	New	<b>Start date:</b>	
<b>Priority:</b>	Normal	<b>Due date:</b>	
<b>Assignee:</b>		<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>vendor_id:</b>	GCD		
<b>Description</b>			

### History

#### #1 - 01/16/2024 07:54 AM - Andrei Bălteanu

- File fwd.df added
- File t1.d added

Assuming we have a persistent table called t1 with only 1 field, f1, which is an integer.

For the following testcase, FWD will not work as expected.

```
/*create t1. t1.f1 = 1.*/
def var copy_f1 like f1 no-undo.
def buffer t1_buff for t1.
form
    t1_buff.f1 at 28 no-label
    with side-labels no-box frame invacc down width 80.
find t1 no-lock.
    assign
        copy_f1 = f1.
message copy_f1.
```

The problem can be found at conversion.

At the time when we want to modify the value of copy\_f1, FWD will use the explicit buffer t1\_buff instead of the implicit one:

```
...
new FindQuery(t1, (String) null, null, "t1.recid asc", LockType.NONE).unique();
copyF1.assign(t1Buff.getF1());
...
```

For simplicity of testing this out, I also attached the .df and .d files.

## Files

---

t1.d	184 Bytes	01/16/2024	Andrei Bălteanu
fwd.df	218 Bytes	01/16/2024	Andrei Bălteanu