

## Re: "Numeric field overflow."

---

*Source:*

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/Access/microsoft.public.access.queries/2006-05/msg01193.html>

---

- *From:* "Allen Browne" <[AllenBrowne@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:AllenBrowne@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sat, 20 May 2006 14:22:58 +0800
- 

Excellent. Solved.

I understand that the Access Development team at Microsoft has been working on improving the import from Excel next version (A2007.)

Access has always had such problems interpreting import data correctly that my standard way of programming a user-level import into a temp table where all fields are text. Then query the temp table to ensure the data in every field can be interpreted correctly, that it typecasts reliably, that there are no values that will fail because they don't match a related table or are not unique, etc, etc. Only after the user fixes the problems in the temp table do we allow the data into the true target table.

--

Allen Browne – Microsoft MVP. Perth, Western Australia.  
Tips for Access users – <http://allenbrowne.com/tips.html>  
Reply to group, rather than allenbrowne at mvps dot org.

"G Lykos" <[GLykos@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:GLykos@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
<news:uLPOZH9eGHA.1204@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>

Allen, finally traced the problem to what is apparently a known problem area – linked Excel spreadsheets. Turns out the link wizard was forcing a Number data type, which really screwed up the works because the column in this case has empty fields. What was really nutty was that the append query would work a first time, then never again until you do something like delete a query field, then add the same field back, and it would work again one time, then break again.

Further, discovered in trying to cause the link wizard to type-cast that column as text – if you tell it that the first row is not a header row, and have text in the first cell of the column, then Access correctly type-casts it as text. However, if you tell it that the first row is a header row, then it starts checking fields on the THIRD row rather than the second –

Re: "Numeric field overflow."

doesn't matter what you put in the second cell, it's ignored. A really stupid programming error, and it's pretty remarkable that it hasn't been corrected. Also came across a Microsoft.com help page with, among other things, an Excel macro that was supposed to help remedy the problem as a work-around by putting a space preamble to selected fields and then removing it, and it didn't make any difference. Imagine all the time wasted by unfortunate users, and the effort that went into investigating it and creating a special page – why don't they just fix the darn thing!!

I appreciated your pointing me to your Web site – the guidance is interesting.

Regards,  
George

"Allen Browne" <AllenBrowne@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:u9CZJ%23keGHA.2172@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:u9CZJ%23keGHA.2172@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

An overflow indicates that a numeric value is outside the range of the field

Access is trying to append it to.

If the source query has calculated fields, you may need to typecast the calculation with CDbl(), CCur(), CLng(), etc. You will probably need to use

Nz() inside that also, to avoid problems with Null.

Another possibility is that the field size in the target table is not adequate. For example, a Number field of size Integer will not accept values

larger than 32767.

If the field sizes are not an issue, and typecasting does not solve the problem, it is possible that Access is confused about what the query is referring to. Try unchecking the Name AutoCorrect boxes under:

Tools | Options | General

Then compact the database:

Tools | Database Utilities | Compact

Info on why:

<http://allenbrowne.com/bug-03.html>

A2003 is not less stable than previous versions. The query engine (JET 4)

Re: "Numeric field overflow."

is

actually the same for Access 2000, 2002, and 2003. This engine is somewhat less efficient (for example with user-defined function calls) and less capable of recognising data types (on calculated fields) than its predecessor (JET 3.5 in Access 97), but it is not less stable.

It is possible to configure A2003 so it is arguably the most stable

version

of Access, at least since version 2. For info on how to do that, see: Preventing corruption

at:

<http://allenbrowne.com/ser-25.html>

"G Lykos" <GLykos@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:eUe%23bBkeGHA.1276@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:eUe%23bBkeGHA.1276@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

Am regularly running into a problem where something snaps and an append query stops running with the captioned error message. I'm not doing any math calculations, just appending selected fields from a filtered record set.

Once this happens, it stays broken until I edit the query (as in add a field, then delete it, functionally taking me back to when I started)

and

then the query works again for a while. It's driving me nuts because I don't know how to identify the source, and I'm tired of having to futs around with nonsense edits to the query to get it working again. Any ideas what might be causing this??

I have the impression after having struggled with this and other oddball Access things this week that Access 2003 SP2, under XP Pro with all

Re: "Numeric field overflow."

updates,  
is kind of buggy. Were earlier releases more stable?