

P A R T

A

Antechamber

The primary focus in this book is to present part of the theory underlying the design and use of very popular systems—namely, the database systems. A brief presentation of the main features of these systems is provided in the first chapter.

The second chapter gives a brief review of the main theoretical tools and results that are used in this volume including some basics from naive set theory and standard computer science material from language, complexity, and computability theories. We also survey aspects of mathematical logic.

In the third chapter, we reach the core material of the book. We introduce the relational model and present the basic notation that will be used throughout the book.

1 Database Systems

Alice: *I thought this was a theory book.*

Vittorio: *Yes, but good theory needs the big picture.*

Sergio: *Besides, what will you tell your grandfather when he asks what you study?*

Riccardo: *You can't tell him that you're studying the fundamental implications of genericity in database queries.*

Computers are now used in almost all aspects of human activity. One of their main uses is to manage information, which in some cases involves simply holding data for future retrieval and in other cases serving as the backbone for managing the life cycle of complex financial or engineering processes. A large amount of data stored in a computer is called a *database*. The basic software that supports the management of this data is called a *database management system* (dbms). The dbms is typically accompanied by a large and evergrowing body of application software that accesses and modifies the stored information. The primary focus in this book is to present part of the theory underlying the design and use of these systems. This preliminary chapter briefly reviews the field of database systems to indicate the larger context that has led to this theory.

1.1 The Main Principles

Database systems can be viewed as mediators between human beings who want to use data and physical devices that hold it (see Fig. 1.1). Early database management was based on explicit usage of *file systems* and customized application software. Gradually, principles and mechanisms were developed that insulated database users from the details of the physical implementation. In the late 1960s, the first major step in this direction was the development of *three-level architecture*. This architecture separated database functionalities into physical, logical, and external levels. (See Fig. 1.2. The three views represent various ways of looking at the database: multirelations, universal relation interface, and graphical interface.)

The separation of the logical definition of data from its physical implementation is central to the field of databases. One of the major research directions in the field has been the development and study of abstract, human-oriented models and interfaces for specifying the structure of stored data and for manipulating it. These models permit the user to concentrate on a logical representation of data that resembles his or her vision of the reality modeled by the data much more closely than the physical representation.




Figure 1.1: Database as mediator between humans and data

Several logical *data models* have been developed, including the hierarchical, network, relational, and object oriented. These include primarily a *data definition language* (DDL) for specifying the structural aspects of the data and a *data manipulation language* (DML) for accessing and updating it. The separation of the logical from the physical has resulted in an extraordinary increase in database usability and programmer productivity.

Another benefit of this separation is that many aspects of the physical implementation may be changed without having to modify the abstract vision of the database. This substantially reduces the need to change existing application programs or retrain users.

The separation of the logical and physical levels of a database system is usually called the *data independence principle*. This is arguably the most important distinction between file systems and database systems.

The second separation in the architecture, between external and logical levels, is also important. It permits different perspectives, or *views*, on the database that are tailored to specific needs. Views hide irrelevant information and restructure data that is retained. Such views may be simple, as in the case of automatic teller machines, or highly intricate, as in the case of computer-aided design systems.

A major issue connected with both separations in the architecture is the trade-off between human convenience and reasonable performance. For example, the separation between logical and physical means that the system must compile queries and updates directed to the logical representation into “real” programs. Indeed, the use of the relational model became widespread only when query optimization techniques made it feasible. More generally, as the field of physical database optimization has matured, logical models have become increasingly remote from physical storage. Developments in hardware (e.g., large and fast memories) are also influencing the field a great deal by continually changing the limits of feasibility.




Figure 1.2: Three-level architecture of database systems

1.2 Functionalities

Modern dbms's include a broad array of functionalities, ranging from the very physical to the relatively abstract. Some functionalities, such as database recovery, can largely be ignored by almost all users. Others (even among the most physical ones, such as indexing) are presented to application programmers in abstracted ways.

The primary functionalities of dbms's are as follows:

Secondary storage management: The goal of dbms's is the management of large amounts of shared data. By *large* we mean that the data is too big to fit in main memory. Thus an essential task of these systems is the management of secondary storage, which involves an array of techniques such as indexing, clustering, and resource allocation.

Persistence: Data should be persistent (i.e., it should survive the termination of a particular database application so that it may be reused later). This is a clear divergence from standard programming, in which a data structure must be coded in a file to live beyond the execution of an application. Persistent programming languages (e.g., persistent C++) are now emerging to overcome this limitation of programming languages.

Concurrency control: Data is shared. The system must support simultaneous access to shared information in a harmonious environment that controls access conflicts and presents a coherent database state to each user. This has led to important notions such as *transaction* and *serializability* and to techniques such as two-phase locking that ensure serializability.

Data protection: The database is an invaluable source of information that must be protected against human and application program errors, computer failures, and human misuse. *Integrity checking mechanisms* focus on preventing inconsistencies in the stored data resulting, for example, from faulty update requests. Database *recovery* and *back-up* protocols guard against hardware failures, primarily by maintaining snapshots of previous database states and logs of transactions in progress. Finally, *security control* mechanisms prevent classes of users from accessing and/or changing sensitive information.

Human-machine interface: This involves a wide variety of features, generally revolving around the logical representation of data. Most concretely, this encompasses DDLs and DMLs, including both those having a traditional linear format and the emerging visual interfaces incorporated in so-called fourth-generation languages. Graphically based tools for database installation and design are popular.

Distribution: In many applications, information resides in distinct locations. Even within a local enterprise, it is common to find interrelated information spread across several databases, either for historical reasons or to keep each database within manageable size. These databases may be supported by different systems (interoperability) and based on distinct models (heterogeneity). The task of providing transparent access to multiple systems is a major research topic of the 1990s.

Compilation and optimization: A major task of database systems is the translation of the requests against the external and logical levels into executable programs. This usually involves one or more compilation steps and intensive optimization so that performance is not degraded by the convenience of using more friendly interfaces.

Some of these features concern primarily the physical data level: concurrency control, recovery, and secondary storage management. Others, such as optimization, are spread across the three levels.

Database theory and more generally, database models have focused primarily on the description of data and on querying facilities. The support for designing application software, which often constitutes a large component of databases in the field, has generally been overlooked by the database research community. In relational systems applications can be written in C and extended with embedded SQL (the standard relational query language) commands for accessing the database. Unfortunately there is a significant distance between the paradigms of C and SQL. The same can be said to a certain extent about fourth-generation languages. Modern approaches to improving application programmer productivity, such as object-oriented or active databases, are being investigated.

1.3 Complexity and Diversity

In addition to supporting diverse functionalities, the field of databases must address a broad variety of uses, styles, and physical platforms. Examples of this variety include the following:

Applications: Financial, personnel, inventory, sales, engineering design, manufacturing control, personal information, etc.

Users: Application programmers and software, customer service representatives, secretaries, database administrators (dba's), computer gurus, other databases, expert systems, etc.

Access modes: Linear and graphical data manipulation languages, special purpose graphical interfaces, data entry, report generation, etc.

Logical models: The most prominent of these are the network, hierarchical, relational, and object-oriented models; and there are variations in each model as implemented by various vendors.

Platforms: Variations in host programming languages, computing hardware and operating systems, secondary storage devices (including conventional disks, optical disks, tape), networks, etc.

Both the quality and quantity of variety compounds the complexity of modern dbms's, which attempt to support as much diversity as possible.

Another factor contributing to the complexity of database systems is their longevity. Although some databases are used by a single person or a handful of users for a year or less, many organizations are using databases implemented over a decade ago. Over the years, layers of application software with intricate interdependencies have been developed for these "legacy" systems. It is difficult to modernize or replace these databases because of the tremendous volume of application software that uses them on a routine basis.

1.4 Past and Future

After the advent of the three-level architecture, the field of databases has become increasingly abstract, moving away from physical storage devices toward human models of information organization. Early dbms's were based on the network and hierarchical models. Both provide some logical organization of data (in graphs and trees), but these representations closely mirror the physical storage of the data. Furthermore, the DMLs for these are primitive because they focus primarily on navigation through the physically stored data.

In the 1970s, Codd's relational model revolutionized the field. In this model, humans view the data as organized in relations (tables), and more "declarative" languages are provided for data access. Indexes and other mechanisms for maintaining the interconnection between data are largely hidden from users. The approach became increasingly accepted as implementation and optimization techniques could provide reasonable response times in spite of the distance between logical and physical data organization. The relational model also provided the initial basis for the development of a mathematical investigation of databases, largely because it bridges the gap between data modeling and mathematical logic.

Historically dbms's were biased toward business applications, and the relational model best fitted the needs. However, the requirements for the management of large, shared amounts of data were also felt in a variety of fields, such as computer-aided design and expert systems. These new applications require more in terms of structures (more complex than relations), control (more dynamic environments), and intelligence (incorporation of knowledge). They have generated research and developments at the border of other fields. Perhaps the most important developments are the following:

Object-oriented databases: These have come from the merging of database technology, object-oriented languages (e.g., C++), and artificial intelligence (via semantic models). In addition to providing richer logical data structures, they permit the incorporation of behavioral information into the database schema. This leads to better interfaces and a more modular perspective on application software; and, in particular, it improves the programmer's productivity.

Deductive and active databases: These originated from the fusion of database technology and, respectively, logic programming (e.g., Prolog) and production-rule systems (e.g., OPS5). The hope is to provide mechanisms that support an abstract view of some aspects of information processing analogous to the abstract view of data provided by logical data models. This processing is generally represented in the form of rules and separated from the control mechanism used for applying the rules.

These two directions are catalysts for significant new developments in the database field.

1.5 Ties with This Book

Over the past two decades, database theory has pursued primarily two directions. The principal one, which is the focus of this book, concerns those topics that can meaningfully be discussed within the logical and external layers. The other, which has a different flavor and is not discussed in this book, is the elegant theory of concurrency control.

The majority of this book is devoted to the study of the relational model. In particular, relational query languages and language primitives such as recursion are studied in depth. The theory of dependencies, which provides the formal foundation of integrity constraints, is also covered. In the last part of the book, we consider more recent topics whose theory is generally less well developed, including object-oriented databases and behavioral aspects of databases.

By its nature, theoretical investigation requires the careful articulation of all assumptions. This leads to a focus on abstract, simplified models of much more complex practical situations. For example, one focus in the early part of this book is on conjunctive queries. These form the core of the *select-from-where* clause of the standard language in database systems, SQL, and are perhaps the most important class of queries from a practical standpoint. However, the conjunctive queries ignore important practical components of SQL, such as arithmetic operations.

Speaking more generally, database theory has focused rather narrowly on specific areas that are amenable to theoretical investigation. Considerable effort has been directed toward the expressive power and complexity of both query languages and dependencies, in which close ties with mathematical logic and complexity theory could be exploited. On the

other hand, little theory has emerged in connection with physical query optimization, in which it is much more difficult to isolate a small handful of crucial features upon which a meaningful theoretical investigation can be based. Other fundamental topics are only now receiving attention in database theory (e.g., the behavioral aspects of databases).

Theoretical research in computer science is driven both by the practical phenomena that it is modeling and by aesthetic and mathematical rigor. Although practical motivations are touched on, this text dwells primarily on the mathematical view of databases and presents many concepts and techniques that have not yet found their place in practical systems. For instance, in connection with query optimization, little is said about the heuristics that play such an important role in current database systems. However, the homomorphism theorem for conjunctive queries is presented in detail; this elegant result highlights the essential nature of conjunctive queries. The text also provides a framework for analyzing a broad range of abstract query languages, many of which are either motivated by, or have influenced, the development of practical languages.

As we shall see, the data independence principle has fundamental consequences for database theory. Indeed, much of the specificity of database theory, and particularly of the theory of query languages, is due to this principle.

With respect to the larger field of database systems, we hope this book will serve a dual purpose: (1) to explain to database system practitioners some of the underlying principles and characteristics of the systems they use or build, and (2) to arouse the curiosity of theoreticians reading this book to learn how database systems are actually created.

Bibliographic Notes

There are many books on database systems, including [Dat86, EN89, KS91, Sto88, Ull88, Ull89b, DA83, Vos91]. A (now old) bibliography on databases is given in [Kam81]. A good introduction to the field may be found in [KS91], whereas [Ull88, Ull89b] provides a more in-depth presentation.

The relational model is introduced in [Cod70]. The first text on the logical level of database theory is [Mai83]. More recent texts on the subject include [PBG89], which focuses on aspects of relational database theory; [Tha91], which covers portions of dependency theory; and [Ull88, Ull89b], which covers both practical and theoretical aspects of the field. The reader is also referred to the excellent survey of relational database theory in [Kan88], which forms a chapter of the *Handbook of Theoretical Computer Science* [Lee91].

Database concurrency control is presented in [Pap86, BHG87]. Deductive databases are covered in [Bid91a, CGT90]. Collections of papers on this topic can be found in [Min88a]. Collections of papers on object-oriented databases are in [BDK92, KL89, ZM90]. Surveys on database topics include query optimization [JK84a, Gra93], deductive databases [GMN84, Min88b, BR88a], semantic database models [HK87, PM88], database programming languages [AB87a], aspects of heterogeneous databases [BLN86, SL90], and active databases [HW92, Sto92]. A forthcoming book on active database systems is [DW94].

2 Theoretical Background

- Alice:** *Will we ever get to the real stuff?*
- Vittorio:** *Cine nu cunoaște lema, nu cunoaște teorema.*
- Riccardo:** *What is Vittorio talking about?*
- Sergio:** *This is an old Romanian saying that means, “He who doesn’t know the lemma doesn’t know the teorema.”*
- Alice:** *I see.*

This chapter gives a brief review of the main theoretical tools and results that are used in this volume. It is assumed that the reader has a degree of maturity and familiarity with mathematics and theoretical computer science. The review begins with some basics from set theory, including graphs, trees, and lattices. Then, several topics from automata and complexity theory are discussed, including finite state automata, Turing machines, computability and complexity theories, and context-free languages. Finally basic mathematical logic is surveyed, and some remarks are made concerning the specializing assumptions typically made in database theory.

2.1 Some Basics

This section discusses notions concerning binary relations, partially ordered sets, graphs and trees, isomorphisms and automorphisms, permutations, and some elements of lattice theory.

A *binary relation* over a (finite or infinite) set S is a subset R of $S \times S$, the cross-product of S with itself. We sometimes write $R(x, y)$ or xRy to denote that $(x, y) \in R$.

For example, if Z is a set, then inclusion (\subseteq) is a binary relation over the power set $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ of Z and also over the *finitary power set* $\mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}}(Z)$ of Z (i.e., the set of all finite subsets of Z). Viewed as sets, the binary relation \leq on the set \mathbf{N} of nonnegative integers properly contains the relation $<$ on \mathbf{N} .

We also have occasion to study n -ary relations over a set S ; these are subsets of S^n , the cross-product of S with itself n times. Indeed, these provide one of the starting points of the relational model.

A binary relation R over S is *reflexive* if $(x, x) \in R$ for each $x \in S$; it is *symmetric* if $(x, y) \in R$ implies that $(y, x) \in R$ for each $x, y \in S$; and it is *transitive* if $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, z) \in R$ implies that $(x, z) \in R$ for each $x, y, z \in S$. A binary relation that is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive is called an *equivalence relation*. In this case, we associate to each $x \in S$ the *equivalence class* $[x]_R = \{y \in S \mid (x, y) \in R\}$.

An example of an equivalence relation on \mathbf{N} is *modulo* for some positive integer n , where $(i, j) \in \text{mod}_n$ if the absolute value $|i - j|$ of the difference of i and j is divisible by n .

A *partition* of a nonempty set S is a family of sets $\{S_i \mid i \in I\}$ such that (1) $\cup_{i \in I} S_i = S$, (2) $S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, and (3) $S_i \neq \emptyset$ for $i \in I$. If R is an equivalence relation on S , then the family of equivalence classes over R is a partition of S .

Let E and E' be equivalence relations on a nonempty set S . E is a *refinement* of E' if $E \subseteq E'$. In this case, for each $x \in S$ we have $[x]_E \subseteq [x]_{E'}$, and, more precisely, each equivalence class of E' is a disjoint union of one or more equivalence classes of E .

A binary relation R over S is *irreflexive* if $(x, x) \notin R$ for each $x \in S$.

A binary relation R is *antisymmetric* if $(y, x) \notin R$ whenever $x \neq y$ and $(x, y) \in R$. A *partial order* of S is a binary relation R over S that is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive. In this case, we call the ordered pair (S, R) a *partially ordered set*. A *total order* is a partial order R over S such that for each $x, y \in S$, either $(x, y) \in R$ or $(y, x) \in R$.

For any set Z , the relation \subseteq over $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ is a partially ordered set. If the cardinality $|Z|$ of Z is greater than 1, then this is not a total order. \leq on \mathbf{N} is a total order.

If (S, R) is a partially ordered set, then a *topological sort* of S (relative to R) is a binary relation R' on S that is a total order such that $R' \supseteq R$. Intuitively, R' is compatible with R in the sense that xRy implies $xR'y$.

Let R be a binary relation over S , and \mathbf{P} be a set of properties of binary relations. The **P-closure** of R is the smallest binary relation R' such that $R' \supseteq R$ and R' satisfies all of the properties in \mathbf{P} (if a unique binary relation having this specification exists). For example, it is common to form the transitive closure of a binary relation or the reflexive and transitive closure of a binary relation. In many cases, a closure can be constructed using a recursive procedure. For example, given binary relation R , the transitive closure R^+ of R can be obtained as follows:

1. If $(x, y) \in R$ then $(x, y) \in R^+$;
2. If $(x, y) \in R^+$ and $(y, z) \in R^+$ then $(x, z) \in R^+$; and
3. Nothing is in R^+ unless it follows from conditions (1) and (2).

For an arbitrary binary relation R , the reflexive, symmetric, and transitive closure of R exists and is an equivalence relation.

There is a close relationship between binary relations and graphs. The definitions and notation for graphs presented here have been targeted for their application in this book. A (*directed*) *graph* is a pair $G = (V, E)$, where V is a finite set of *vertexes* and $E \subseteq V \times V$. In some cases, we define a graph by presenting a set E of edges; in this case, it is understood that the vertex set is the set of endpoints of elements of E .

A *directed path* in G is a nonempty sequence $p = (v_0, \dots, v_n)$ of vertexes such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$ for each $i \in [0, n - 1]$. This path is from v_0 to v_n and has length n . An *undirected path* in G is a nonempty sequence $p = (v_0, \dots, v_n)$ of vertexes such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$ or $(v_{i+1}, v_i) \in E$ for each $i \in [0, n - 1]$. A (directed or undirected) path is *proper* if $v_i \neq v_j$ for each $i \neq j$. A (*directed* or *undirected*) *cycle* is a (directed or undirected, respectively) path v_0, \dots, v_n such that $v_n = v_0$ and $n > 0$. A directed cycle is proper if v_0, \dots, v_{n-1} is a proper path. An undirected cycle is proper if v_0, \dots, v_{n-1} is a proper

path and $n > 2$. If G has a cycle from v , then G has a proper cycle from v . A graph $G = (V, E)$ is *acyclic* if it has no cycles or, equivalently, if the transitive closure of E is irreflexive.

Any binary relation over a finite set can be viewed as a graph. For any finite set Z , the graph $(\mathcal{P}(Z), \subseteq)$ is acyclic. An interesting directed graph is (M, L) , where M is the set of metro stations in Paris and $(s_1, s_2) \in L$ if there is a train in the system that goes from s_1 to s_2 without stopping in between. Another directed graph is (M, L') , where $(s_1, s_2) \in L'$ if there is a train that goes from s_1 to s_2 , possibly with intermediate stops.

Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph. Two vertexes u, v are *connected* if there is an undirected path in G from u to v , and they are *strongly connected* if there are directed paths from u to v and from v to u . Connectedness and strong connectedness are equivalence relations on V . A (*strongly*) *connected component* of G is an equivalence class of V under (strong) connectedness. A graph is (strongly) connected if it has exactly one (strongly) connected component.

The graph (M, L) of Parisian metro stations and nonstop links between them is strongly connected. The graph $(\{a, b, c, d, e\}, \{(a, b), (b, a), (b, c), (c, d), (d, e), (e, c)\})$ is connected but not strongly connected.

The *distance* $d(a, b)$ of two nodes a, b in a graph is the length of the shortest path connecting a to b [$d(a, b) = \infty$ if a is not connected to b]. The *diameter* of a graph G is the maximum finite distance between two nodes in G .

A *tree* is a graph that has exactly one vertex with no in-edges, called the *root*, and no undirected cycles. For each vertex v of a tree there is a unique proper path from the root to v . A *leaf* of a tree is a vertex with no outedges. A tree is connected, but it is not strongly connected if it has more than one vertex. A *forest* is a graph that consists of a set of trees. Given a forest, removal of one edge increases the number of connected components by exactly one.

An example of a tree is the set of all descendants of a particular person, where (p, p') is an edge if p' is the child of p .

In general, we shall focus on directed graphs, but there will be occasions to use undirected graphs. An *undirected graph* is a pair $G = (V, E)$, where V is a finite set of vertexes and E is a set of two-element subsets of V , again called *edges*. The notions of path and connected generalize to undirected graphs in the natural fashion.

An example of an undirected graph is the set of all persons with an edge $\{p, p'\}$ if p is married to p' . As defined earlier, a tree $T = (V, E)$ is a directed graph. We sometimes view T as an undirected graph.

We shall have occasions to *label* the vertexes or edges of a (directed or undirected) graph. For example, a *labeling* of the vertexes of a graph $G = (V, E)$ with label set L is a function $\lambda : V \rightarrow L$.

Let $G = (V, E)$ and $G' = (V', E')$ be two directed graphs. A function $h : V \rightarrow V'$ is a *homomorphism* from G to G' if for each pair $u, v \in V$, $(u, v) \in E$ implies $(h(u), h(v)) \in E'$. The function h is an *isomorphism* from G to G' if h is a one-one onto mapping from V to V' , h is a homomorphism from G to G' , and h^{-1} is a homomorphism from G' to G . An *automorphism* on G is an isomorphism from G to G . Although we have defined these terms for directed graphs, they generalize in the natural fashion to other data and algebraic structures, such as relations, algebraic groups, etc.

Consider the graph $G = (\{a, b, c, d, e\}, \{(a, b), (b, a), (b, c), (b, d), (b, e), (c, d), (d, e), (e, c)\})$. There are three automorphisms on G : (1) the identity; (2) the function that maps c to d , d to e , e to c and leaves a, b fixed; and (3) the function that maps c to e , d to c , e to d and leaves a, b fixed.

Let S be a set. A *permutation* of S is a one-one onto function $\rho : S \rightarrow S$. Suppose that x_1, \dots, x_n is an arbitrary, fixed listing of the elements of S (without repeats). Then there is a natural one-one correspondence between permutations ρ on S and listings x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_n} of elements of S without repeats. A permutation ρ' is *derived* from permutation ρ by an *exchange* if the listings corresponding to ρ and ρ' agree everywhere except at some positions i and $i + 1$, where the values are exchanged. Given two permutations ρ and ρ' , ρ' can be derived from ρ using a finite sequence of exchanges.

2.2 Languages, Computability, and Complexity

This area provides one of the foundations of theoretical computer science. A general reference for this area is [LP81]. References on automata theory and languages include, for instance, the chapters [BB91, Per91] of [Lee91] and the books [Gin66, Har78]. References on complexity include the chapter [Joh91] of [Lee91] and the books [GJ79, Pap94].

Let Σ be a finite set called an *alphabet*. A *word* over alphabet Σ is a finite sequence $a_1 \dots a_n$, where $a_i \in \Sigma$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, $n \geq 0$. The *length* of $w = a_1 \dots a_n$, denoted $|w|$, is n . The empty word ($n = 0$) is denoted by ϵ . The *concatenation* of two words $u = a_1 \dots a_n$ and $v = b_1 \dots b_k$ is the word $a_1 \dots a_n b_1 \dots b_k$, denoted uv . The concatenation of u with itself n times is denoted u^n . The set of all words over Σ is denoted by Σ^* . A *language* over Σ is a subset of Σ^* . For example, if $\Sigma = \{a, b\}$, then $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ is a language over Σ . The concatenation of two languages L and K is $LK = \{uv \mid u \in L, v \in K\}$. L concatenated with itself n times is denoted L^n , and $L^* = \bigcup_{n \geq 0} L^n$.

Finite Automata

In databases, one can model various phenomena using words over some finite alphabet. For example, sequences of database events form words over some alphabet of events. More generally, everything is mapped internally to a sequence of bits, which is nothing but a word over alphabet $\{0, 1\}$. The notion of computable query is also formalized using a low-level representation of a database as a word.

An important type of computation over words involves *acceptance*. The objective is to accept precisely the words that belong to some language of interest. The simplest form of acceptance is done using *finite-state automata* (fsa). Intuitively, fsa process words by scanning the word and remembering only a bounded amount of information about what has already been scanned. This is formalized by computation allowing a finite set of states and transitions among the states, driven by the input. Formally, an fsa M over alphabet Σ is a 5-tuple $\langle S, \Sigma, \delta, s_0, F \rangle$, where

- S is a finite set of *states*;
- δ , the *transition function*, is a mapping from $S \times \Sigma$ to S ;

- s_0 is a particular state of S , called the *start* state;
- F is a subset of S called the *accepting* states.

An fsa $\langle S, \Sigma, \delta, s_0, F \rangle$ works as follows. The given input word $w = a_1 \dots a_n$ is read one symbol at a time, from left to right. This can be visualized as a tape on which the input word is written and an fsa with a head that reads symbols from the tape one at a time. The fsa starts in state s_0 . One move in state s consists of reading the current symbol a in w , moving to a new state $\delta(s, a)$, and moving the head to the next symbol on the right. If the fsa is in an accepting state after the last symbol in w has been read, w is accepted. Otherwise it is rejected. The language accepted by an fsa M is denoted $L(M)$.

For example, let M be the fsa

$\{\text{even, odd}\}, \{0, 1\}, \delta, \text{even}, \{\text{even}\},$	with	δ	0	1
		even	even	odd
		odd	odd	even

The language accepted by M is

$$L(M) = \{w \mid w \text{ has an even number of occurrences of } 1\}.$$

A language accepted by some fsa is called a *regular language*. Not all languages are regular. For example, the language $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ is not regular. Intuitively, this is so because no fsa can remember the number of a 's scanned in order to compare it to the number of b 's, if this number is large enough, due to the boundedness of the memory. This property is formalized by the so-called *pumping lemma* for regular languages.

As seen, one way to specify regular languages is by writing an fsa accepting them. An alternative, which is often more convenient, is to specify the shape of the words in the language using so-called regular expressions. A regular expression over Σ is written using the symbols in Σ and the operations concatenation, $*$ and $+$. (The operation $+$ stands for union.) For example, the foregoing language $L(M)$ can be specified by the regular expression $((0^*10^*)^2)^* + 0^*$. To see how regular languages can model things of interest to databases, think of employees who can be affected by the following events:

hire, transfer, quit, fire, retire.

Throughout his or her career, an employee is first hired, can be transferred any number of times, and eventually quits, retires, or is fired. The language whose words are allowable sequences of such events can be specified by a regular expression as *hire (transfer)* (quit + fire + retire)*. One of the nicest features of regular languages is that they have a dual characterization using fsa and regular expressions. Indeed, Kleene's theorem says that a language L is regular iff it can be specified by a regular expression.

There are several important variations of fsa that do not change their accepting power. The first allows scanning the input back and forth any number of times, yielding *two-way*

automata. The second is *nondeterminism*. A nondeterministic fsa allows several possible next states in a given move. Thus several computations are possible on a given input. A word is accepted if there is at least one computation that ends in an accepting state. Nondeterministic fsa (nfsa) accept the same set of languages as fsa. However, the number of states in the equivalent deterministic fsa may be exponential in the number of states of the nondeterministic one. Thus nondeterminism can be viewed as a convenience allowing much more succinct specification of some regular languages.

Turing Machines and Computability

Turing machines (TMs) provide the classical formalization of computation. They are also used to develop classical complexity theory. Turing machines are like fsa, except that symbols can also be overwritten rather than just read, the head can move in either direction, and the amount of tape available is infinite. Thus a move of a TM consists of reading the current tape symbol, overwriting the symbol with a new one from a specified finite *tape alphabet*, moving the head left or right, and changing state. Like an fsa, a TM can be viewed as an acceptor. The language accepted by a TM M , denoted $L(M)$, consists of the words w such that, on input w , M halts in an accepting state. Alternatively, one can view TM as a generator of words. The TM starts on empty input. To indicate that some word of interest has been generated, the TM goes into some specified state and then continues. Typically, this is a nonterminating computation generating an infinite language. The set of words so generated by some TM M is denoted $G(M)$. Finally, TMs can also be viewed as computing a function from input to output. A TM M computes a partial mapping f from Σ^* to Σ^* if for each $w \in \Sigma^*$: (1) if w is in the domain of f , then M halts on input w with the tape containing the word $f(w)$; (2) otherwise M does not halt on input w .

A function f from Σ^* to Σ^* is *computable* iff there exists some TM computing it. Church's thesis states that any function computable by some reasonable computing device is also computable in the aforementioned sense. So the definition of computability by TMs is robust. In particular, it is insensitive to many variations in the definition of TM, such as allowing multiple tapes. A particularly important variation allows for nondeterminism, similar to nondeterministic fsa. In a nondeterministic TM (NTM), there can be a choice of moves at each step. Thus an NTM has several possible computations on a given input (of which some may be terminating and others not). A word w is accepted by an NTM M if there exists at least one computation of M on w halting in an accepting state.

Another useful variation of the Turing machine is the *counter machine*. Instead of a tape, the counter machine has two stacks on which elements can be pushed or popped. The machine can only test for emptiness of each stack. Counter machines can also define all computable functions. An essentially equivalent and useful formulation of this fact is that the language with integer variables i, j, \dots , two instructions *increment*(i) and *decrement*(i), and a looping construct *while* $i > 0$ *do*, can define all computable functions on the integers.

Of course, we are often interested in functions on domains other than words—integers are one example. To talk about the computability of such functions on other domains, one goes through an encoding in which each element d of the domain is represented as a word

$enc(d)$ on some fixed, finite alphabet. Given that encoding, it is said that f is computable if the function $enc(f)$ mapping $enc(d)$ to $enc(f(d))$ is computable. This often works without problems, but occasionally it raises tricky issues that are discussed in a few places of this book (particularly in Part E).

It can be shown that a language is $L(M)$ for some acceptor TM M iff it is $G(M)$ for some generator TM M . A language is *recursively enumerable* (r.e.) iff it is $L(M)$ [or $G(M)$] for some TM M . L being r.e. means that there is an algorithm that is guaranteed to say eventually *yes* on input w if $w \in L$ but may run forever if $w \notin L$ (if it stops, it says *no*). Thus one can never know for sure if a word is not in L .

Informally, saying that L is recursive means that there is an algorithm that always decides in finite time whether a given word is in L . If $L = L(M)$ and M always halts, L is *recursive*. A language whose complement is r.e. is called *co-r.e.* The following useful facts can be shown:

1. If L is r.e. and co-r.e., then it is recursive.
2. L is r.e. iff it is the domain of a computable function.
3. L is r.e. iff it is the range of a computable function.
4. L is recursive iff it is the range of a computable nondecreasing function.¹

As is the case for computability, the notion of recursive is used in many contexts that do not explicitly involve languages. Suppose we are interested in some class of objects called thing-a-ma-jigs. Among these, we want to distinguish widgets, which are those thing-a-ma-jigs with some desirable property. It is said that it is *decidable* if a given thing-a-ma-jig is a widget if there is an algorithm that, given a thing-a-ma-jig, decides in finite time whether the given thing-a-ma-jig is a widget. Otherwise the property is *undecidable*. Formally, thing-a-ma-jigs are encoded as words over some finite alphabet. The property of being a widget is decidable iff the language of words encoding widgets is recursive.

We mention a few classical undecidable problems. The *halting problem* asks if a given TM M halts on a specified input w . This problem is undecidable (i.e., there is no algorithm that, given the description of M and the input w , decides in finite time if M halts on w). More generally it can be shown that, in some precise sense, all nontrivial questions about TMs are undecidable (this is formalized by *Rice's theorem*). A more concrete undecidable problem, which is useful in proofs, is the *Post correspondence problem* (PCP). The input to the PCP consists of two lists

$$u_1, \dots, u_n; \quad v_1, \dots, v_n;$$

of words over some alphabet Σ with at least two symbols. A solution to the PCP is a sequence of indexes i_1, \dots, i_k , $1 \leq i_j \leq n$, such that

$$u_{i_1} \dots u_{i_k} = v_{i_1} \dots v_{i_k}.$$

¹ f is nondecreasing if $|f(w)| \geq |w|$ for each w .

The question of interest is whether there is a solution to the PCP. For example, consider the input to the PCP problem:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} u_1 & u_2 & u_3 & u_4 & v_1 & v_2 & v_3 & v_4 & \\ aba & bbb & aab & bb & a & aaa & abab & babba. & \end{array}$$

For this input, the PCP has the solution 1, 4, 3, 1; because

$$u_1 u_4 u_3 u_1 = ababbaababa = v_1 v_4 v_3 v_1.$$

Now consider the input consisting of just u_1, u_2, u_3 and v_1, v_2, v_3 . An easy case analysis shows that there is no solution to the PCP for this input. In general, it has been shown that it is undecidable whether, for a given input, there exists a solution to the PCP.

The PCP is particularly useful for proving the undecidability of other problems. The proof technique consists of *reducing* the PCP to the problem of interest. For example, suppose we are interested in the question of whether a given thing-a-ma-jig is a widget. The reduction of the PCP to the widget problem consists of finding a computable mapping f that, given an input i to the PCP, produces a thing-a-ma-jig $f(i)$ such that $f(i)$ is a widget iff the PCP has a solution for i . If one can find such a reduction, this shows that it is undecidable if a given thing-a-ma-jig is a widget. Indeed, if this were decidable then one could find an algorithm for the PCP: Given an input i to the PCP, first construct the thing-a-ma-jig $f(i)$, and then apply the algorithm deciding if $f(i)$ is a widget. Because we know that the PCP is undecidable, the property of being a widget cannot be decidable. Of course, any other known undecidable problem can be used in place of the PCP.

A few other important undecidable problems are mentioned in the review of context-free grammars.

Complexity

Suppose a particular problem is solvable. Of course, this does not mean the problem has a *practical* solution, because it may be prohibitively expensive to solve it. Complexity theory studies the difficulty of problems. Difficulty is measured relative to some resources of interest, usually time and space. Again the usual model of reference is the TM. Suppose L is a recursive language, accepted by a TM M that always halts. Let f be a function on positive integers. M is said to use time bounded by f if on every input w , M halts in at most $f(|w|)$ steps. M uses space bounded by f if the amount of tape used by M on every input w is at most $f(|w|)$. The set of recursive languages accepted by TMs using time (space) bounded by f is denoted $\text{TIME}(f)$ ($\text{SPACE}(f)$). Let \mathcal{F} be a set of functions on positive integers. Then $\text{TIME}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \text{TIME}(f)$, and $\text{SPACE}(\mathcal{F}) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \text{SPACE}(f)$. A particularly important class of bounding functions is the polynomials Poly . For this class, the following notation has emerged: $\text{TIME}(\text{Poly})$ is denoted PTIME , and $\text{SPACE}(\text{Poly})$ is denoted PSPACE . Membership in the class PTIME is often regarded as synonymous to tractability (although, of course, this is not reasonable in all situations, and a case-by-case judgment should be made). Besides the polynomials, it is of interest to consider lower bounds, like logarithmic space. However, because the input itself takes more than logarithmic space to write down, a

separation of the input tape from the tape used throughout the computation must be made. Thus the input is given on a read-only tape, and a separate worktape is added. Now let LOGSPACE consist of the recursive languages L that are accepted by some such TM using on input w an amount of worktape bounded by $c \times \log(|w|)$ for some constant c .

Another class of time-bounding functions we shall use is the so-called *elementary* functions. They consist of the set of functions

$$\text{Hyp} = \{\text{hyp}_i \mid i \geq 0\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \begin{aligned} \text{hyp}_0(n) &= n \\ \text{hyp}_{i+1}(n) &= 2^{\text{hyp}_i(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

The *elementary languages* are those in $\text{TIME}(\text{Hyp})$.

Nondeterministic TMs can be used to define complexity classes as well. An NTM uses time bounded by f if all computations on input w halt after at most $f(|w|)$ steps. It uses space bounded by f if all computations on input w use at most $f(|w|)$ space (note that termination is not required). The set of recursive languages accepted by some NTM using time bounded by a polynomial is denoted NP, and space bounded by a polynomial is denoted NPSPACE. Are nondeterministic classes different from their deterministic counterparts? For polynomial space, Savitch's theorem settles the question by showing that PSPACE = NPSPACE (the theorem actually applies to a much more general class of space bounds). For time, things are more complicated. Indeed, the question of whether PTIME equals NP is the most famous open problem in complexity theory. It is generally conjectured that the two classes are distinct.

The following inclusions hold among the complexity classes described:

$$\text{LOGSPACE} \subseteq \text{PTIME} \subseteq \text{NP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE} \subset \text{TIME}(\text{Hyp}) = \text{SPACE}(\text{Hyp}).$$

All nonstrict inclusions are conjectured to be strict.

Complexity classes of languages can be extended, in the same spirit, to complexity classes of computable functions. Here we look at the resources needed to compute the function rather than just accepting or rejecting the input word.

Consider some complexity class, say $C = \text{TIME}(\mathcal{F})$. Such a class contains all problems that can be solved in time bounded by some function in \mathcal{F} . This is an upper bound, so C clearly contains some easy and some hard problems. How can the hard problems be distinguished from the easy ones? This is captured by the notion of *completeness* of a problem in a complexity class. The idea is as follows: A language K in C is complete in C if solving it allows solving all other problems in C , also within C . This is formalized by the notion of *reduction*. Let L and K be languages in C . L is reducible to K if there is a computable mapping f such that for each w , $w \in L$ iff $f(w) \in K$. The definition of reducibility so far guarantees that solving K allows solving L . How about the complexity? Clearly, if the reduction f is hard then we do not have an acceptance algorithm in C . Therefore the complexity of f must be bounded. It might be tempting to use C as the bound. However, this allows all the work of solving L within the reduction, which really makes K irrelevant. Therefore the definition of completeness in a class C requires that the complexity of the reduction function be lower than that for C . More formally, a recursive

language is complete in C by C' reductions if for each $L \in C$ there is a function f in C' reducing L to K . The class C' is often understood for some of the main classes C . The conventions we will use are summarized in the following table:

<i>Type of Completeness</i>	<i>Type of Reduction</i>
P completeness	LOGSPACE reductions
NP completeness	PTIME reductions
PSPACE completeness	PTIME reductions

Note that to prove that a problem L is complete in C by C' reductions, it is sufficient to exhibit another problem K that is known to be complete in C by C' reductions, and a C' reduction from K to L . Because the C' -reducibility relation is transitive for all customarily used C' , it then follows that L is itself C complete by C' reductions. We mention next a few problems that are complete in various classes.

One of the best-known NP-complete problems is the so-called *3-satisfiability (3-SAT)* problem. The input is a propositional formula in conjunctive normal form, in which each conjunct has at most three literals. For example, such an input might be

$$(\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_4 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (\neg x_4 \vee x_3 \vee \neg x_1).$$

The question is whether the formula is satisfiable. For example, the preceding formula is satisfied with the truth assignment $\xi(x_1) = \xi(x_2) = \text{false}$, $\xi(x_3) = \xi(x_4) = \text{true}$. (See Section 2.3 for the definitions of propositional formula and related notions.)

A useful PSPACE-complete problem is the following. The input is a quantified propositional formula (all variables are quantified). The question is whether the formula is true. For example, an input to the problem is

$$\exists x_1 \forall x_2 \forall x_3 \exists x_4 [(\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_4 \vee \neg x_2) \wedge (x_1 \vee x_2 \vee x_4) \wedge (\neg x_4 \vee x_3 \vee \neg x_1)].$$

A number of well-known games, such as GO, have been shown to be PSPACE complete.

For PTIME completeness, one can use a natural problem related to context-free grammars (defined next). The input is a context-free grammar G and the question is whether $L(G)$ is empty.

Context-Free Grammars

We have discussed specification of languages using two kinds of acceptors: fsa and TM. Context-free grammars (CFGs) provide different approach to specifying a language that emphasizes the generation of the words in the language rather than acceptance. (Nonetheless, this can be turned into an accepting mechanism by *parsing*.) A CFG is a 4-tuple $\langle N, \Sigma, S, P \rangle$, where

- N is a finite set of *nonterminal symbols*;
- Σ is a finite alphabet of *terminal symbols*, disjoint from N ;

- S is a distinguished symbol of N , called the *start symbol*;
- P is a finite set of *productions* of the form $\xi \rightarrow w$, where $\xi \in N$ and $w \in (N \cup \Sigma)^*$.

A CFG $G = \langle N, \Sigma, S, P \rangle$ defines a language $L(G)$ consisting of all words in Σ^* that can be *derived* from S by repeated applications of the productions. An application of the production $\xi \rightarrow w$ to a word v containing ξ consists of replacing one occurrence of ξ by w . If u is obtained by applying a production to some word v , this is denoted by $u \Rightarrow v$, and the transitive closure of \Rightarrow is denoted $\xRightarrow{*}$. Thus $L(G) = \{w \mid w \in \Sigma^*, S \xRightarrow{*} w\}$. A language is called *context free* if it is $L(G)$ for some CFG G . For example, consider the grammar $\langle \{S\}, \{a, b\}, S, P \rangle$, where P consists of the two productions

$$\begin{aligned} S &\rightarrow \epsilon, \\ S &\rightarrow aSb. \end{aligned}$$

Then $L(G)$ is the language $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. For example the following is a derivation of $a^2 b^2$:

$$S \Rightarrow aSb \Rightarrow a^2 S b^2 \Rightarrow a^2 b^2.$$

The specification power of CFGs lies between that of fsa's and that of TMs. First, all regular languages are context free and all context-free languages are recursive. The language $\{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 0\}$ is context free but not regular. An example of a recursive language that is not context free is $\{a^n b^n c^n \mid n \geq 0\}$. The proof uses an extension to context-free languages of the pumping lemma for regular languages. We also use a similar technique in some of the proofs.

The most common use of CFGs in the area of databases is to view certain objects as CFGs and use known (un)decidability properties about CFGs. Some questions about CFGs known to be decidable are (1) emptiness [is $L(G)$ empty?] and (2) finiteness [is $L(G)$ finite?]. Some undecidable questions are (3) containment [is it true that $L(G_1) \subseteq L(G_2)$?] and (4) equality [is it true that $L(G_1) = L(G_2)$?].

2.3 Basics from Logic

The field of mathematical logic is a main foundation for database theory. It serves as the basis for languages for queries, deductive databases, and constraints. We briefly review the basic notions and notations of mathematical logic and then mention some key differences between this logic in general and the specializations usually considered in database theory. The reader is referred to [EFT84, End72] for comprehensive introductions to mathematical logic, and to the chapter [Apt91] in [Lee91] and [Llo87] for treatments of Herbrand models and logic programming.

Although some previous knowledge of logic would help the reader understand the content of this book, the material is generally self-contained.

Propositional Logic

We begin with the *propositional calculus*. For this we assume an infinite set of *propositional variables*, typically denoted p, q, r, \dots , possibly with subscripts. We also permit the special *propositional constants* *true* and *false*. (Well-formed) *propositional formulas* are constructed from the propositional variables and constants, using the unary connective *negation* (\neg) and the binary connectives *disjunction* (\vee), *conjunction* (\wedge), *implication* (\rightarrow), and *equivalence* (\leftrightarrow). For example, p , $(p \wedge (\neg q))$ and $((p \vee q) \rightarrow p)$ are well-formed propositional formulas. We generally omit parentheses if not needed for understanding a formula.

A *truth assignment* for a set V of propositional variables is a function $\xi : V \rightarrow \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$. The *truth value* $\varphi[\xi]$ of a propositional formula φ under truth assignment ξ for the variables occurring in φ is defined by induction on the structure of φ in the natural manner. For example,

- $\text{true}[\xi] = \text{true}$;
- if $\varphi = p$ for some variable p , then $\varphi[\xi] = \xi(p)$;
- if $\varphi = (\neg\psi)$ then $\varphi[\xi] = \text{true}$ iff $\psi[\xi] = \text{false}$;
- $(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)[\xi] = \text{true}$ iff at least one of $\psi_1[\xi] = \text{true}$ or $\psi_2[\xi] = \text{true}$.

If $\varphi[\xi] = \text{true}$ we say that $\varphi[\xi]$ is true and that φ is true under ξ (and similarly for false).

A formula φ is *satisfiable* if there is at least one truth assignment that makes it true, and it is *unsatisfiable* otherwise. It is *valid* if each truth assignment for the variables in φ makes it true. The formula $(p \vee q)$ is satisfiable but not valid; the formula $(p \wedge (\neg p))$ is unsatisfiable; and the formula $(p \vee (\neg p))$ is valid.

A formula φ *logically implies* formula ψ (or ψ is a *logical consequence* of φ), denoted $\varphi \models \psi$ if for each truth assignment ξ , if $\varphi[\xi]$ is true, then $\psi[\xi]$ is true. Formulas φ and ψ are (*logically*) *equivalent*, denoted $\varphi \equiv \psi$, if $\varphi \models \psi$ and $\psi \models \varphi$.

For example, $(p \wedge (p \rightarrow q)) \models q$. Many equivalences for propositional formulas are well known. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2) &\equiv ((\neg\varphi_1) \vee \varphi_2); & \neg(\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) &\equiv (\neg\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2); \\ (\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \wedge \varphi_3 &\equiv (\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_3) \vee (\varphi_2 \wedge \varphi_3); & \varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2 &\equiv \varphi_1 \wedge (\varphi_1 \wedge \neg\varphi_2); \\ (\varphi_1 \vee (\varphi_2 \vee \varphi_3)) &\equiv ((\varphi_1 \vee \varphi_2) \vee \varphi_3). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the last equivalence permits us to view \vee as a polyadic connective. (The same holds for \wedge .)

A *literal* is a formula of the form p or $\neg p$ (or *true* or *false*) for some propositional variable p . A propositional formula is in *conjunctive normal form* (CNF) if it has the form $\psi_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \psi_n$, where each formula ψ_i is a disjunction of literals. *Disjunctive normal form* (DNF) is defined analogously. It is known that if φ is a propositional formula, then there is some formula ψ equivalent to φ that is in CNF (respectively DNF). Note that if φ is in CNF (or DNF), then a shortest equivalent formula ψ in DNF (respectively CNF) may have a length exponential in the length of φ .

First-Order Logic

We now turn to *first-order predicate calculus*. We indicate the main intuitions and concepts underlying first-order logic and describe the primary specializations typically made for database theory. Precise definitions of needed portions of first-order logic are included in Chapters 4 and 5.

First-order logic generalizes propositional logic in several ways. Intuitively, propositional variables are replaced by predicate symbols that range over n -ary relations over an underlying set. Variables are used in first-order logic to range over elements of an abstract set, called the *universe of discourse*. This is realized using the quantifiers \exists and \forall . In addition, function symbols are incorporated into the model. The most important definitions used to formalize first-order logic are first-order language, interpretation, logical implication, and provability.

Each first-order language L includes a set of variables, the propositional connectives, the quantifiers \exists and \forall , and punctuation symbols “)”, “(”, and “;”. The variation in first-order languages stems from the symbols they include to represent constants, predicates, and functions. More formally, a first-order language includes

- (a) a (possibly empty) set of *constant symbols*;
- (b) for each $n \geq 0$ a (possibly empty) set of *n -ary predicate symbols*;
- (c) for each $n \geq 1$ a (possibly empty) set of *n -ary function symbols*.

In some cases, we also include

- (d) the equality symbol \approx , which serves as a binary predicate symbol,

and the propositional constants *true* and *false*. It is common to focus on languages that are finite, except for the set of variables.

A familiar first-order language is the language $L_{\mathbb{N}}$ of the nonnegative integers, with

- (a) constant symbol $\mathbf{0}$;
- (b) binary predicate symbol \leq ;
- (c) binary function symbols $+$, \times , and unary \mathbf{S} (successor);

and the equality symbol.

Let L be a first-order language. *Terms* of L are built in the natural fashion from constants, variables, and the function symbols. An *atom* is either *true*, *false*, or an expression of the form $R(t_1, \dots, t_n)$, where R is an n -ary predicate symbol and t_1, \dots, t_n are terms. Atoms correspond to the propositional variables of propositional logic. If the equality symbol is included, then atoms include expressions of the form $t_1 \approx t_2$. The family of (*well-formed predicate calculus*) *formulas* over L is defined recursively starting with atoms, using the Boolean connectives, and using the quantifiers as follows: If φ is a formula and x a variable, then $(\exists x\varphi)$ and $(\forall x\varphi)$ are formulas. As with the propositional case, parentheses are omitted when understood from the context. In addition, \vee and \wedge are viewed as polyadic connectives. A term or formula is *ground* if it involves no variables.

Some examples of formulas in $L_{\mathbb{N}}$ are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \forall x(\mathbf{0} \leq x), \quad \neg(x \approx \mathbf{S}(x)), \\ \neg\exists x(\forall y(y \leq x)), \quad \forall y\forall z(x \approx y \times z \rightarrow (y \approx \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0}) \vee z \approx \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0}))). \end{aligned}$$

(For some binary predicates and functions, we use infix notation.)

The notion of the scope of quantifiers and of *free* and *bound* occurrences of variables in formulas is now defined using recursion on the structure. Each variable occurrence in an atom is free. If φ is $(\psi_1 \vee \psi_2)$, then an occurrence of variable x in φ is free if it is free as an occurrence of ψ_1 or ψ_2 ; and this is extended to the other propositional connectives. If φ is $\exists y\psi$, then an occurrence of variable $x \neq y$ is free in φ if the corresponding occurrence is free in ψ . Each occurrence of y is bound in φ . In addition, each occurrence of y in φ that is free in ψ is said to be in the *scope* of $\exists y$ at the beginning of φ . A *sentence* is a well-formed formula that has no free variable occurrences.

Until now we have not given a meaning to the symbols of a first-order language and thereby to first-order formulas. This is accomplished with the notion of *interpretation*, which corresponds to the truth assignments of the propositional case. Each interpretation is just one of the many possible ways to give meaning to a language.

An *interpretation* of a first-order language L is a 4-tuple $\mathcal{I} = (U, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{F})$ where U is a nonempty set of abstract elements called the *universe (of discourse)*, and \mathcal{C} , \mathcal{P} , and \mathcal{F} give meanings to the sets of constant symbols, predicate symbols, and function symbols. For example, \mathcal{C} is a function from the constant symbols into U , and \mathcal{P} maps each n -ary predicate symbol p into an n -ary relation over U (i.e., a subset of U^n). It is possible for two distinct constant symbols to map to the same element of U .

When the *equality symbol* denoted \approx is included, the meaning associated with it is restricted so that it enjoys properties usually associated with equality. Two equivalent mechanisms for accomplishing this are described next.

Let \mathcal{I} be an interpretation for language L . As a notational shorthand, if c is a constant symbol in L , we use $c^{\mathcal{I}}$ to denote the element of the universe associated with c by \mathcal{I} . This is extended in the natural way to ground terms and atoms.

The usual interpretation for the language $L_{\mathbf{N}}$ is $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}}$, where the universe is \mathbf{N} ; $\mathbf{0}$ is mapped to the number 0; \leq is mapped to the usual less than or equal relation; \mathbf{S} is mapped to successor; and $+$ and \times are mapped to addition and multiplication. In such cases, we have, for example, $[\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0}) + \mathbf{0})]^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}}} \approx 2$.

As a second example related to logic programming, we mention the family of *Herbrand interpretations* of $L_{\mathbf{N}}$. Each of these shares the same universe and the same mappings for the constant and function symbols. An assignment of a universe, and for the constant and function symbols, is called a *preinterpretation*. In the Herbrand preinterpretation for $L_{\mathbf{N}}$, the universe, denoted $U_{L_{\mathbf{N}}}$, is the set containing $\mathbf{0}$ and all terms that can be constructed from this using the function symbols of the language. This is a little confusing because the terms now play a dual role—as terms constructed from components of the language L , and as elements of the universe $U_{L_{\mathbf{N}}}$. The mapping \mathcal{C} maps the constant symbol $\mathbf{0}$ to $\mathbf{0}$ (considered as an element of $U_{L_{\mathbf{N}}}$). Given a term t in U , the function $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{S})$ maps t to the term $\mathbf{S}(t)$. Given terms t_1 and t_2 , the function $\mathcal{F}(+)$ maps the pair (t_1, t_2) to the term $+(t_1, t_2)$, and the function $\mathcal{F}(\times)$ is defined analogously.

The set of ground atoms of $L_{\mathbf{N}}$ (i.e., the set of atoms that do not contain variables) is sometimes called the *Herbrand base* of $L_{\mathbf{N}}$. There is a natural one-one correspondence

between interpretations of $L_{\mathbf{N}}$ that extend the Herbrand preinterpretation and subsets of the Herbrand base of $L_{\mathbf{N}}$. One Herbrand interpretation of particular interest is the one that mimics the usual interpretation. In particular, this interpretation maps \leq to the set $\{(t_1, t_2) \mid (t_1^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}}}, t_2^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}}}) \in \leq^{\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}}}\}$.

We now turn to the notion of satisfaction of a formula by an interpretation. The definition is recursive on the structure of formulas; as a result we need the notion of variable assignment to accommodate variables occurring free in formulas. Let L be a language and \mathcal{I} an interpretation of L with universe U . A *variable assignment* for formula φ is a partial function $\mu : \text{variables of } L \rightarrow U$ whose domain includes all variables free in φ . For terms t , $t^{\mathcal{I}, \mu}$ denotes the meaning given to t by \mathcal{I} , using μ to interpret the free variables. In addition, if μ is a variable assignment, x is a variable, and $u \in U$, then $\mu[x/u]$ denotes the variable assignment that is identical to μ , except that it maps x to u . We write $\mathcal{I} \models \varphi[\mu]$ to indicate that \mathcal{I} *satisfies* φ under μ . This is defined recursively on the structure of formulas in the natural fashion. To indicate the flavor of the definition, we note that $\mathcal{I} \models p(t_1, \dots, t_n)[\mu]$ if $(t_1^{\mathcal{I}, \mu}, \dots, t_n^{\mathcal{I}, \mu}) \in p^{\mathcal{I}}$; $\mathcal{I} \models \exists x \psi[\mu]$ if there is some $u \in U$ such that $\mathcal{I} \models \psi[\mu[x/u]]$; and $\mathcal{I} \models \forall x \psi[\mu]$ if for each $u \in U$, $\mathcal{I} \models \psi[\mu[x/u]]$. The Boolean connectives are interpreted in the usual manner. If φ is a sentence, then no variable assignment needs to be specified.

For example, $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}} \models \forall x \exists y (\neg(x \approx y) \vee x \leq y)$; $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}} \not\models \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0}) \leq \mathbf{0}$; and

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{N}} \models \forall y \forall z (x \approx y \times z \rightarrow (y \approx \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0}) \vee z \approx \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{0})))[\mu]$$

iff $\mu(x)$ is 1 or a prime number.

An interpretation \mathcal{I} is a *model* of a set Φ of sentences if \mathcal{I} satisfies each formula in Φ . The set Φ is *satisfiable* if it has a model.

Logical implication and equivalence are now defined analogously to the propositional case. Sentence φ logically implies sentence ψ , denoted $\varphi \models \psi$, if each interpretation that satisfies φ also satisfies ψ . There are many straightforward equivalences [e.g., $\neg(\neg\varphi) \equiv \varphi$ and $\neg\forall x \varphi \equiv \exists x \neg\varphi$]. Logical implication is generalized to sets of sentences in the natural manner.

It is known that logical implication, considered as a decision problem, is not recursive. One of the fundamental results of mathematical logic is the development of effective procedures for determining logical equivalence. These are based on the notion of *proofs*, and they provide one way to show that logical implication is r.e. One style of proof, attributed to Hilbert, identifies a family of *inference rules* and a family of *axioms*. An example of an inference rule is *modus ponens*, which states that from formulas φ and $\varphi \rightarrow \psi$ we may conclude ψ . Examples of axioms are all *tautologies* of propositional logic [e.g., $\neg(\varphi \vee \psi) \leftrightarrow (\neg\varphi \wedge \neg\psi)$ for all formulas φ and ψ], and *substitution* (i.e., $\forall x \varphi \rightarrow \varphi_t^x$, where t is an arbitrary term and φ_t^x denotes the formula obtained by simultaneously replacing all occurrences of x free in φ by t). Given a family of inference rules and axioms, a *proof* that set Φ of sentences implies sentence φ is a finite sequence $\psi_0, \psi_1, \dots, \psi_n = \varphi$, where for each i , either ψ_i is an axiom, or a member of Φ , or it follows from one or more of the previous ψ_j 's using an inference rule. In this case we write $\Phi \vdash \varphi$.

The soundness and completeness theorem of Gödel shows that (using *modus ponens* and a specific set of axioms) $\Phi \models \varphi$ iff $\Phi \vdash \varphi$. This important link between \models and \vdash permits the transfer of results obtained in model theory, which focuses primarily on in-

interpretations and models, and proof theory, which focuses primarily on proofs. Notably, a central issue in the study of relational database dependencies (see Part C) has been the search for sound and complete proof systems for subsets of first-order logic that correspond to natural families of constraints.

The model-theoretic and proof-theoretic perspectives lead to two equivalent ways of incorporating equality into first-order languages. Under the model-theoretic approach, the equality predicate \approx is given the meaning $\{(u, u) \mid u \in U\}$ (i.e., normal equality). Under the proof-theoretic approach, a set of *equality axioms* EQ_L is constructed that express the intended meaning of \approx . For example, EQ_L includes the sentences $\forall x, y, z(x \approx y \wedge y \approx z \rightarrow x \approx z)$ and $\forall x, y(x \approx y \rightarrow (R(x) \leftrightarrow R(y)))$ for each unary predicate symbol R .

Another important result from mathematical logic is the compactness theorem, which can be demonstrated using Gödel's soundness and completeness result. There are two common ways of stating this. The first is that given a (possibly infinite) set of sentences Φ , if $\Phi \models \varphi$ then there is a finite $\Phi' \subseteq \Phi$ such that $\Phi' \models \varphi$. The second is that if each finite subset of Φ is satisfiable, then Φ is satisfiable.

Note that although the compactness theorem guarantees that the Φ in the preceding paragraph has a model, that model is not necessarily finite. Indeed, Φ may only have infinite models. It is of some solace that, among those infinite models, there is surely at least one that is countable (i.e., whose elements can be enumerated: a_1, a_2, \dots). This technically useful result is the Löwenheim-Skolem theorem.

To illustrate the compactness theorem, we show that there is no set Ψ of sentences defining the notion of connectedness in directed graphs. For this we use the language L with two constant symbols, a and b , and one binary relation symbol R , which corresponds to the edges of a directed graph. In addition, because we are working with general first-order logic, both finite and infinite graphs may arise. Suppose now that Ψ is a set of sentences that states that a and b are connected (i.e., that there is a directed path from a to b in R). Let $\Sigma = \{\sigma_i \mid i > 0\}$, where σ_i states “ a and b are at least i edges apart from each other.” For example, σ_3 might be expressed as

$$\neg R(a, b) \wedge \neg \exists x_1 (R(a, x_1) \wedge R(x_1, b)).$$

It is clear that each finite subset of $\Psi \cup \Sigma$ is satisfiable. By the compactness theorem (second statement), this implies that $\Psi \cup \Sigma$ is satisfiable, so it has a model (say, \mathcal{I}). In \mathcal{I} , there is no directed path between (the elements of the universe identified by) a and b , and so $\mathcal{I} \not\models \Psi$. This is a contradiction.

Specializations to Database Theory

We close by mentioning the primary differences between the general field of mathematical logic and the specializations made in the study of database theory. The most obvious specialization is that database theory has not generally focused on the use of functions on data values, and as a result it generally omits function symbols from the first-order languages used. The two other fundamental specializations are the focus on finite models and the special use of constant symbols.

An interpretation is *finite* if its universe of discourse is finite. Because most databases

are finite, most of database theory is focused exclusively on finite interpretations. This is closely related to the field of finite model theory in mathematics.

The notion of logical implication for finite interpretations, usually denoted \models_{fin} , is not equivalent to the usual logical implication \models . This is most easily seen by considering the compactness theorem. Let $\Phi = \{\sigma_i \mid i > 0\}$, where σ_i states that there are at least i distinct elements in the universe of discourse. Then by compactness, $\Phi \not\models \text{false}$, but by the definition of finite interpretation, $\Phi \models_{\text{fin}} \text{false}$.

Another way to show that \models and \models_{fin} are distinct uses computability theory. It is known that \models is r.e. but not recursive, and it is easily seen that \models_{fin} is co-r.e. Thus if they were equal, \models would be recursive, a contradiction.

The final specialization of database theory concerns assumptions made about the universe of discourse and the use of constant symbols. Indeed, throughout most of this book we use a fixed, countably infinite set of constants, denoted **dom** (for domain elements). Furthermore, the focus is almost exclusively on finite Herbrand interpretations over **dom**. In particular, for distinct constants c and c' , all interpretations that are considered satisfy $\neg c \approx c'$.

Most proofs in database theory involving the first-order predicate calculus are based on model theory, primarily because of the emphasis on finite models and because the link between \models_{fin} and \vdash does not hold. It is thus informative to identify a mechanism for using traditional proof-theoretic techniques within the context of database theory. For this discussion, consider a first-order language with set **dom** of constant symbols and predicate symbols R_1, \dots, R_n . As will be seen in Chapter 3, a database *instance* is a finite Herbrand interpretation **I** of this language. Following [Rei84], a family $\Sigma_{\mathbf{I}}$ of sentences is associated with **I**. This family includes the axioms of equality (mentioned earlier) and

Atoms: $R_i(\vec{a})$ for each \vec{a} in $R_i^{\mathbf{I}}$.

Extension axioms: $\forall \vec{x}(R_i(\vec{x}) \leftrightarrow (\vec{x} \approx \vec{a}_1 \vee \dots \vee \vec{x} \approx \vec{a}_m))$, where $\vec{a}_1, \dots, \vec{a}_m$ is a listing of all elements of $R_i^{\mathbf{I}}$, and we are abusing notation by letting \approx range over vectors of terms.

Unique Name axioms: $\neg c \approx c'$ for each distinct pair c, c' of constants occurring in **I**.

Domain Closure axiom: $\forall x(x \approx c_1 \vee \dots \vee x \approx c_n)$, where c_1, \dots, c_n is a listing of all constants occurring in **I**.

A set of sentences obtained in this manner is termed an *extended relational theory*.

The first two sets of sentences of an extended relational theory express the specific contents of the relations (predicate symbols) of **I**. Importantly, the Extension sentences ensure that for any (not necessarily Herbrand) interpretation \mathcal{J} satisfying $\Sigma_{\mathbf{I}}$, an n -tuple is in $R_i^{\mathcal{J}}$ iff it equals one of the n -tuples in $R_i^{\mathbf{I}}$. The Unique Name axiom ensures that no pair of distinct constants is mapped to the same element in the universe of \mathcal{J} , and the Domain Closure axiom ensures that each element of the universe of \mathcal{J} equals some constant occurring in **I**. For all intents and purposes, then, any interpretation \mathcal{J} that models $\Sigma_{\mathbf{I}}$ is isomorphic to **I**, modulo condensing under equivalence classes induced by $\approx^{\mathcal{J}}$. Importantly, the following link with conventional logical implication now holds: For any set Γ of sentences, $\mathbf{I} \models \Gamma$ iff $\Sigma_{\mathbf{I}} \cup \Gamma$ is satisfiable. The perspective obtained through this connection with clas-

sical logic is useful when attempting to extend the conventional relational model (e.g., to incorporate so-called incomplete information, as discussed in Chapter 19).

The Extension axioms correspond to the intuition that a tuple \vec{a} is in relation R only if it is explicitly included in R by the database instance. A more general formulation of this intuition is given by the *closed world assumption* (CWA) [Rei78]. In its most general formulation, the CWA is an inference rule that is used in proof-theoretic contexts. Given a set Σ of sentences describing a (possibly nonconventional) database instance, the CWA states that one can infer a negated atom $R(\vec{a})$ if $\Sigma \not\vdash R(\vec{a})$ [i.e., if one cannot prove $R(\vec{a})$ from Σ using conventional first-order logic]. In the case where Σ is an extended relational theory this gives no added information, but in other contexts (such as deductive databases) it does. The CWA is related in spirit to the *negation as failure* rule of [Cla78].

3 The Relational Model

Alice: *What is a relation?*

Vittorio: *You studied that in math a long time ago.*

Sergio: *It is just a table.*

Riccardo: *But we have several ways of viewing it.*

A *database model* provides the means for specifying particular data structures, for constraining the data sets associated with these structures, and for manipulating the data. The specification of structure and constraints is done using a *data definition language* (DDL), and the specification of manipulation is done using a *data manipulation language* (DML). The most prominent structures that have been used for databases to date are graphs in the network, semantic, and object-oriented models; trees in the hierarchical model; and relations in the relational model.

DMLs provide two fundamental capabilities: *querying* to support the extraction of data from the current database; and *updating* to support the modification of the database state. There is a rich theory on the topic of querying relational databases that includes several languages based on widely different paradigms. This theory is the focus of Parts B, D, and E, and portions of Part F of this book. The theory of database updates has received considerably less attention and is touched on in Part F.

The term *relational model* is actually rather vague. As introduced in Codd's seminal article, this term refers to a specific data model with relations as data structures, an algebra for specifying queries, and no mechanisms for expressing updates or constraints. Subsequent articles by Codd introduced a second query language based on the predicate calculus of first-order logic, showed this to be equivalent to the algebra, and introduced the first integrity constraints for the relational model—namely, functional dependencies. Soon thereafter, researchers in database systems implemented languages based on the algebra and calculus, extended to include update operators and to include practically motivated features such as arithmetic operators, aggregate operators, and sorting capabilities. Researchers in database theory developed a number of variations on the algebra and calculus with varying expressive power and adapted the paradigm of logic programming to provide a third approach to querying relational databases. The story of integrity constraints for the relational model is similar: A rich theory of constraints has emerged, and two distinct but equivalent perspectives have been developed that encompass almost all of the constraints that have been investigated formally. The term *relational model* has thus come to refer to the broad class of database models that have relations as the data structure and that incorporate some or all of the query capabilities, update capabilities, and integrity constraints

mentioned earlier. In this book we are concerned primarily with the relational model in this broad sense.

Relations are simple data structures. As a result, it is easy to understand the conceptual underpinnings of the relational model, thus making relational databases accessible to a broad audience of end users. A second advantage of this simplicity is that clean yet powerful declarative languages can be used to manipulate relations. By *declarative*, we mean that a query/program is specified in a high-level manner and that an efficient execution of the program does not have to follow exactly its specification. Thus the important practical issues of compilation and optimization of queries had to be overcome to make relational databases a reality.

Because of its simplicity, the relational model has provided an excellent framework for the first generation of theoretical research into the properties of databases. Fundamental aspects of data manipulation and integrity constraints have been exposed and studied in a context in which the peculiarities of the data model itself have relatively little impact. This research provides a strong foundation for the study of other database models, first because many theoretical issues pertinent to other models can be addressed effectively within the relational model, and second because it provides a variety of tools, techniques, and research directions that can be used to understand the other models more deeply.

In this short chapter, we present formal definitions for the data structure of the relational model. Theoretical research on the model has grown out of three different perspectives, one corresponding most closely to the natural usage of relations in databases, another stemming from mathematical logic, and the third stemming from logic programming. Because each of these provides important intuitive and notational benefits, we introduce notation that encompasses the different but equivalent formulations reflecting each of them.

3.1 The Structure of the Relational Model

An example of a relational database is shown in Fig. 3.1¹. Intuitively, the data is represented in tables in which each row gives data about a specific object or set of objects, and rows with uniform structure and intended meaning are grouped into tables. Updates consist of transformations of the tables by addition, removal, or modification of rows. Queries allow the extraction of information from the tables. A fundamental feature of virtually all relational query languages is that the result of a query is also a table or collection of tables.

We introduce now some informal terminology to provide the intuition behind the formal definitions that follow. Each table is called a relation and it has a name (e.g., *Movies*). The columns also have names, called attributes (e.g., *Title*). Each line in a table is a tuple (or record). The entries of tuples are taken from sets of constants, called domains, that include, for example, the sets of integers, strings, and Boolean values. Finally we distinguish between the database schema, which specifies the structure of the database; and the database instance, which specifies its actual content. This is analogous to the standard distinction between type and value found in programming languages (e.g., an

¹ *Pariscope* is a weekly publication that lists the cultural events occurring in Paris and environs.

<i>Movies</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Director</i>	<i>Actor</i>
	The Trouble with Harry	Hitchcock	Gwenn
	The Trouble with Harry	Hitchcock	Forsythe
	The Trouble with Harry	Hitchcock	MacLaine
	The Trouble with Harry	Hitchcock	Hitchcock

	Cries and Whispers	Bergman	Andersson
	Cries and Whispers	Bergman	Sylwan
	Cries and Whispers	Bergman	Thulin
	Cries and Whispers	Bergman	Ullman

<i>Location</i>	<i>Theater</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Phone Number</i>
	Gaumont Opéra	31 bd. des Italiens	47 42 60 33
	Saint André des Arts	30 rue Saint André des Arts	43 26 48 18
	Le Champo	51 rue des Ecoles	43 54 51 60

	Georges V	144 av. des Champs-Élysées	45 62 41 46
	Les 7 Montparnassiens	98 bd. du Montparnasse	43 20 32 20

<i>Pariscope</i>	<i>Theater</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Schedule</i>
	Gaumont Opéra	Cries and Whispers	20:30
	Saint André des Arts	The Trouble with Harry	20:15
	Georges V	Cries and Whispers	22:15

	Les 7 Montparnassiens	Cries and Whispers	20:45

Figure 3.1: The CINEMA database

identifier X might have type *record* $A : int, B : bool$ and value *record* $A : 5, B : true$ end*record*).

We now embark on the formal definitions. We assume that a countably infinite set **att** of *attributes* is fixed. For a technical reason that shall become apparent shortly, we assume that there is a total order $\leq_{\mathbf{att}}$ on **att**. When a set U of attributes is listed, it is assumed that the elements of U are written according to $\leq_{\mathbf{att}}$ unless otherwise specified.

For most of the theoretical development, it suffices to use the same domain of values for all of the attributes. Thus we now fix a countably infinite set **dom** (disjoint from **att**), called the underlying *domain*. A *constant* is an element of **dom**. When different attributes should have distinct domains, we assume a mapping Dom on **att**, where $Dom(A)$ is a set called the domain of A .

We assume a countably infinite set **relname** of relation names disjoint from the previous sets. In practice, the structure of a table is given by a relation name and a set of attributes. To simplify the notation in the theoretical treatment, we now associate a *sort* (i.e., finite set of attributes) to each relation name. (An analogous approach is usually taken in logic.) In particular, we assume that there is a function *sort* from **relname** to $\mathcal{P}^{\text{fin}}(\mathbf{att})$ (the *finitary powerset* of **att**; i.e., the family of finite subsets of **att**). It is assumed that *sort* has the property that for each (possibly empty) finite set U of attributes, $\text{sort}^{-1}(U)$ is infinite. This allows us to use as many relation names of a given sort as desired. The *sort* of a relation name is simply $\text{sort}(R)$. The *arity* of a relation name R is $\text{arity}(R) = |\text{sort}(R)|$.

A *relation schema* is now simply a relation name R . We sometimes write this as $R[U]$ to indicate that $\text{sort}(R) = U$, or $R[n]$, to indicate that $\text{arity}(R) = n$. A *database schema* is a nonempty finite set **R** of relation names. This might be written $\mathbf{R} = \{R_1[U_1], \dots, R_n[U_n]\}$ to indicate the relation schemas in **R**.

For example, the database schema **CINEMA** for the database shown in Fig. 3.1 is defined by

$$\mathbf{CINEMA} = \{Movies, Location, Pariscope\}$$

where relation names *Movies*, *Location*, and *Pariscope* have the following sorts:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sort}(Movies) &= \{Title, Director, Actor\} \\ \text{sort}(Location) &= \{Theater, Address, Phone Number\} \\ \text{sort}(Pariscope) &= \{Theater, Title, Schedule\}. \end{aligned}$$

We often omit commas and set brackets in sets of attributes. For example, we may write

$$\text{sort}(Pariscope) = Theater Title Schedule.$$

The formalism that has emerged for the relational model is somewhat eclectic, because it is intimately connected with several other areas that have their own terminology, such as logic and logic programming. Because the slightly different formalisms are well entrenched, we do not attempt to replace them with a single, unified notation. Instead we will allow the coexistence of the different notations; the reader should have no difficulty dealing with the minor variations.

Thus there will be two forks in the road that lead to different but largely equivalent formulations of the relational model. The first fork in the road to defining the relational model is of a philosophical nature. Are the attribute names associated with different relation columns important?

3.2 Named versus Unnamed Perspectives

Under the *named* perspective, these attributes are viewed as an explicit part of a database schema and may be used (e.g., by query languages and dependencies). Under the *unnamed*

perspective, the specific attributes in the sort of a relation name are ignored, and only the arity of a relation schema is available (e.g., to query languages).

In the named perspective, it is natural to view tuples as functions. More precisely, a *tuple* over a (possibly empty) finite set U of attributes (or over a relation schema $R[U]$) is a total mapping u from U to **dom**. In this case, the *sort* of u is U , and it has *arity* $|U|$. Tuples may be written in a linear syntax using angle brackets—for example, $\langle A : 5, B : 3 \rangle$. (In general, the order used in the linear syntax will correspond to \leq_{att} , although that is not necessary.) The unique tuple over \emptyset is denoted $\langle \rangle$.

Suppose that u is a tuple over U . As usual in mathematics, the value of u on an attribute A in U is denoted $u(A)$. This is extended so that for $V \subseteq U$, $u[V]$ denotes the tuple v over V such that $v(A) = u(A)$ for each $A \in V$ (i.e., $u[V] = u|_V$, the restriction of the function u to V).

With the unnamed perspective, it is more natural to view a tuple as an element of a Cartesian product. More precisely, a *tuple* is an ordered n -tuple ($n \geq 0$) of constants (i.e., an element of the Cartesian product **dom** ^{n}). The arity of a tuple is the number of coordinates that it has. Tuples in this context are also written with angle brackets (e.g., $\langle 5, 3 \rangle$). The i^{th} coordinate of a tuple u is denoted $u(i)$. If relation name R has arity n , then a *tuple* over R is a tuple with arity $\text{arity}(R)$.

Because of the total order \leq_{att} , there is a natural correspondence between the named and unnamed perspectives. A tuple $\langle A_1 : a_1, A_2 : a_2 \rangle$ (defined as a function) can be viewed (assuming $A_1 \leq_{\text{att}} A_2$) as an ordered tuple with $(A_1 : a_1)$ as a first component and $(A_2 : a_2)$ as a second one. Ignoring the names, this tuple may simply be viewed as the ordered tuple $\langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$. Conversely, the ordered tuple $t = \langle a_1, a_2 \rangle$ may be interpreted as a function over the set $\{1, 2\}$ of integers with $t(i) = a_i$ for each i . This correspondence will allow us to blur the distinction between the two perspectives and move freely from one to the other when convenient.

3.3 Conventional versus Logic Programming Perspectives

We now come to the second fork in the road to defining the relational model. This fork concerns how relation and database instances are viewed, and it is essentially independent of the perspective taken on tuples. Under the *conventional* perspective, a *relation* or *relation instance* of (or over) a relation schema $R[U]$ (or over a finite set U of attributes) is a (possibly empty) finite set I of tuples with sort U . In this case, I has *sort* U and *arity* $|U|$. Note that there are two instances over the empty set of attributes: $\{\}$ and $\{\langle \rangle\}$.

Continuing with the conventional perspective, a *database instance* of database schema **R** is a mapping **I** with domain **R**, such that **I**(R) is a relation over R for each $R \in \mathbf{R}$.

The other perspective for defining instances stems from logic programming. This perspective is used primarily with the ordered-tuple perspective on tuples, and so we focus on that here. Let R be a relation with arity n . A *fact* over R is an expression of the form $R(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, where $a_i \in \mathbf{dom}$ for $i \in [1, n]$. If $u = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$, we sometimes write $R(u)$ for $R(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. Under the *logic-programming* perspective, a *relation (instance)* over R is a finite set of facts over R . For a database schema **R**, a *database instance* is a finite set **I** that is the union of relation instances over R , for $R \in \mathbf{R}$. This perspective on

instances is convenient when working with languages stemming from logic programming, and it permits us to write database instances in a convenient linear form.

The two perspectives provide alternative ways of describing essentially the same data. For instance, assuming that $sort(R) = AB$ and $sort(S) = A$, we have the following four representations of the same database:

Named and Conventional

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(R) &= \{f_1, f_2, f_3\} \\
 & \quad f_1(A) = a \quad f_1(B) = b \\
 & \quad f_2(A) = c \quad f_2(B) = b \\
 & \quad f_3(A) = a \quad f_3(A) = a \\
 I(S) &= \{g\} \\
 & \quad g(A) = d
 \end{aligned}$$

Unnamed and Conventional

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(R) &= \{\langle a, b \rangle, \langle c, b \rangle, \langle a, a \rangle\} \\
 I(S) &= \{\langle d \rangle\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Named and Logic Programming

$$\{R(A : a, B : b), R(A : c, B : b), R(A : a, B : a), S(A : d)\}$$

Unnamed and Logic Programming

$$\{R(a, b), R(c, b), R(a, a), S(d)\}.$$

Because relations can be viewed as sets, it is natural to consider, given relations of the same sort, the standard set operations *union* (\cup), *intersection* (\cap), and *difference* ($-$) and the standard set comparators \subset , \subseteq , $=$, and \neq . With the logic-programming perspective on instances, we may also use these operations and comparators on database instances.

Essentially all topics in the theory of relational database can be studied using a fixed choice for the two forks. However, there are some cases in which one perspective is much more natural than the other or is technically much more convenient. For example, in a context in which there is more than one relation, the named perspective permits easy and natural specification of correspondences between columns of different relations whereas the unnamed perspective does not. As will be seen in Chapter 4, this leads to different but equivalent sets of natural primitive algebra operators for the two perspectives. A related example concerns those topics that involve the association of distinct domains to different relation columns; again the named perspective is more convenient. In addition, although relational dependency theory can be developed for the unnamed perspective, the motivation is much more natural when presented in the named perspective. Thus during the course of this book the choice of perspective during a particular discussion will be motivated primarily by the intuitive or technical convenience offered by one or the other.

In this book, we will need an infinite set **var** of *variables* that will be used to range over elements of **dom**. We generalize the notion of tuple to permit variables in coordinate positions: a *free tuple* over U or $R[U]$ is (under the named perspective) a function u from U to **var** \cup **dom**. An *atom* over R is an expression $R(e_1, \dots, e_n)$, where $n = \text{arity}(R)$ and

e_i is *term* (i.e., $e_i \in \mathbf{var} \cup \mathbf{dom}$ for each $i \in [1, n]$). Following the terminology of logic and logic programming, we sometimes refer to a fact as a *ground* atom.

3.4 Notation

We generally use the following symbols, possibly with subscripts:

Constants	a, b, c
Variables	x, y
Sets of variables	X, Y
Terms	e
Attributes	A, B, C
Sets of attributes	U, V, W
Relation names (schemas)	$R, S; R[U], S[V]$
Database schemas	R, S
Tuples	t, s
Free tuples	u, v, w
Facts	$R(a_1, \dots, a_n), R(t)$
Atoms	$R(e_1, \dots, e_n), R(u)$
Relation instances	I, J
Database instances	I, J

Bibliographic Notes

The relational model is founded on mathematical logic (in particular, predicate calculus). It is one of the rare cases in which substantial theoretical development preceded the implementation of systems. The first proposal to use predicate calculus as a query language can be traced back to Kuhns [Kuh67]. The relational model itself was introduced by Codd [Cod70]. There are numerous commercial database systems based on the relational model. They include IBM's DB2, [A⁺76], INGRES [SWKH76], and ORACLE [Ora89], Informix, and Sybase.

Other data models have been proposed and implemented besides the relational model. The most prominent ones preceding the relational model are the hierarchical and network models. These and other models are described in the books [Nij76, TL82]. More recently, various models extending the relational model have been proposed. They include semantic models (see the survey [HK87]) and object-oriented models (see the position paper [ABD⁺89]). In this book we focus primarily on the relational model in a broad sense. Some formal aspects of other models are considered in Part F.