On Nov 5, 11:44 am, Paul <paulsta...@gmail.com> wrote:
> Now that -1 is a valid array index, does it make sense for WHERE to
> return it as a null result?

This was discussed at length last year, before the choices in 8.0 were
made. It absolutely has to keep returning -1 if called the same way,
or it would break a lot of old code - many tests are made comparing
the result with -1, instead of using the count argument. Living with
the consequences of the past, as David said.

New code can make use of the (new, obviously) null keyword, that makes
it return !null instead of -1. And the use of !null as index was made
to go nicely with that, so that doing assigning with a !null index
does nothing, with no errors, and retrieving with a !null index
returns !null, also with no errors.