Chapter 8
Relational Database Languages: Relational Calculus

Overview

- the relational calculus is a specialization of first-order logic, tailored to relational databases.
- straightforward: the only structuring means of relational databases are relations – each relation can be seen as an interpretation of a predicate.
- there exists a **declarative** semantics.

Relational Calculus vs FOL

- FOL allows for reasoning, based on a *model theory*,
- the relational calculus does not require model theory,
- it is only concerned with *validity* of a formula in a given, fixed model (the database state).

8.1 Bridge Section: Motivation and Preparation for the "Deductive Databases" Lecture

- The lecture "Database Theory" or "Deductive Databases" (MSc or advanced BSc) builds upon the "Introduction to Databases" lecture and requires knowledge about First-Order Logic (e.g., courses "Formal Systems" or "Artificial Intelligence")
- for a diagram with the database concepts, notions and buzzwords related to the DBIS lectures, see
  `https://www.dbis.informatik.uni-goettingen.de/Teaching/dbnotions.pdf`
- This section summarizes that knowledge and motivates the main idea of the lecture.
- a database can be seen as a purely relational FOL structure
  - predicate symbols of different arities,
  - only 0-ary functions = constants
    - in relational DB: these are the literals (numbers, strings, dates ...)
    - in object-relational DB: also object identifiers
    - in RDF: also URIs, which basically serve as object identifiers

Computer Science: Theoretical and Practical Aspects – illustrated with Deductive Databases

CS in Practice: | Theoretical CS, maths, etc.:

Databases

Software Engineering, Programming languages, ...

Formal Methods: formalization of commonsense reasoning

modeling,
symbolic reasoning,
deduction/calculi,
parsing, grammars,
semantics, ...

metalevel:
properties of the FMs

application-specific formal methods:

- relational algebra
- normalization theory
- transaction theory

SQL

- first-order logic
- relational calculus
- Datalog: queries+rules deductive DB*

- polynomial
- equalities, complexity

→ optimization

phil. & math. logic in general

- undecidable
- polynomial
- polynomial,
- up to exponential

* I did not place deductive DB to completely practical CS

Relational Algebra, First-Order Logic, Relational Calculus, Datalog



Declarative Querying & Algebraic Semantics

Query: all pairs *country* (name) and *organization* (name) such that the country is a member of the organization.

```
SELECT c.name, o.name
FROM country c, organization o
WHERE (c.code, o.abbreviation) IN (SELECT country, organization
                                   FROM ismember)
```



- declarative query in SQL and as algebra tree (bottom-up inductive semantics)
- actual naive evaluation would be inefficient.

Declarative Querying & Algebraic Semantics

- algebraically equivalent rewriting of the tree,
- efficient evaluation using internal algorithms (more efficient, but correct wrt. the set-oriented algebraic semantics of the operators) and indexes (physical layer):
- start with ismember, search ismember.country→country.code primary key index, then join results.organization→organization.abbreviation primary key index



RELATIONAL CALCULUS: LOGIC-BASED DECLARATIVE QUERYING

- positional matching of predicate patterns:

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(pop) \equiv \quad & \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, area, \text{country}(\text{“Germany”}, cc, cap, capprov, pop, area).\\
q(cn, on) \equiv \quad & \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca, abbrev, hq, hqc, hqprov, est, type :\\
& \text{country}(cn, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca) \wedge\\
& \text{organization}(abbrev, on, hq, hqc, hqprov, est) \wedge\\
& \text{ismember}(cc, abbrev, type)
\end{aligned}
$$

- purely declarative
- “conjunctive query”, translatable to relational algebra SPJR-query (selection-projection-renaming-join)
- free variables (here, cn, on) create the result tuples,

$$
\begin{aligned}
answer = \{ \; & \{cn/\text{“Germany”}, on/\text{“Europ.Union”}\}, \{cn/\text{“Germany”}, on/\text{“North.Atl.Tr.Org”}\}, \ldots,\\
& \{cn/\text{“France”}, on/\text{“Europ.Union”}\}, \{cn/\text{“France”}, on/\text{“North.Atl.Tr.Org”}\}, \ldots,\\
& \vdots\\
& \}
\end{aligned}
$$

Logic-Based Declarative Querying: Negation – not exists

Query: all (names of) countries that are not located in Europe:

```
SELECT c.name
FROM country c
WHERE NOT EXISTS (SELECT *
                  FROM encompasses
                  WHERE e.continent='Europe'
                    AND e.country = c.code)
```

$$
\begin{aligned}
q(cn) \equiv \quad & \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca\\
& \text{country}(cn, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca) \wedge \neg\exists perc : \text{encompasses}(cc, \text{“Europe”}, p)
\end{aligned}
$$





Closed-World-Assumption: Negation – not exists

- In databases, all tuples that are not there are implicit *negative knowledge*
- query from previous slide:
  "all countries *such that there is no tuple in the the database* that states that the country would be located in Europe"

⇒ "Negation by default"

⇒ consistent with the assumption that the database contains complete knowledge.

- as a first-order/predicate logic interpretation, for all answer bindings β (that bind the variable cn),

$$(\mathcal{S}, \beta) \models \quad \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca :$$
$$\text{country}(cn, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca) \wedge \neg\exists perc : \text{encompasses}(cc, \text{"Europe"}, p)$$

- let φ the conjunction of all facts (=atoms) that are true in the database,

$$\varphi \not\models \quad \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca :$$
$$\text{country}(cn, cc, cap, capprov, cpop, ca) \wedge \neg\exists perc : \text{encompasses}(cc, \text{"Europe"}, p)$$

since $\neg\exists perc : \text{encompasses}(cc, \text{"Europe"}, p)$ *cannot logically be concluded* ("Open World")

Negation: Safety of Variables

Consider just a binary *isMember* relationship for mondial without the membership type:

$$q(c) \equiv \neg\text{ismember}(c, \text{"EU"})$$

- what are the answers?
- "USA", "AUS", . . . , but also "Moscow", "Berlin", 356000, 3.1415 etc., infinitely many, for which the tuple is not true.

⇒ depends on the considered *domain*.

⇒ every query must be *safe*, i.e., the variables must have a positive occurrence that restricts the possible values:

$$q'(c) \equiv \quad \exists\, name, c, cap, capprov, cpop, ca :$$
$$\text{country}(name, c, cap, capprov, cpop, ca) \wedge \neg\text{ismember}(c, \text{"EU"})$$

Rule-Based Languages

$$head \leftarrow body$$

- SQL: body = FROM ... WHERE ...,
  head = SELECT ..., DELETE
  similar: MODIFY <relname> WHERE ..., INSERT INTO ... (SFW ...)
- SQL views: derive new tuple(s) when body is satisfied
- An SQL view must not be recursive (i.e., contain itself in the "body" part)

Datalog: Queries and Logical Rules

```
?- country(N, _C, _Cap, _CapProv, _Pop, _Area), not isMember(_C, 'EU', _).
```

Two rules that together compute for each river, to which sea its water finally flows:

```
:- include(mondial).
tc(N,S) :- river(N,R,L,S,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_), not (S = null).
tc(N,S) :- river(N,R,L,S2,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,_), not (R = null), tc(R,S).
```

[Filename: Datalog/tcRivers.P]

- Declarative "fixpoint" semantics: apply rules bottom-up as long as possible.

The Universal Quantifier in Query Languages

- SQL: `EXISTS`/`NOT EXISTS` has been integrated into the SQL syntax
  (implemented via Join, Minus, Anti-Join)
- The universal quantifier must be rewritten as `NOT EXISTS ... WHERE NOT EXISTS ...`
- the relational calculus obviously allows it:

$$\begin{aligned} q(cn) \equiv \quad & \exists\, cc, cap, capprov, pop, area : \\ & (\text{country}(cn, cc, cap, capprov, pop, area) \wedge \\ & \forall n, prov, cpoplat, long, el : (\text{city}(n, cc, prov, cpop, lat, long, el) \rightarrow cpop > 1000000)) \end{aligned}$$

- Datalog: universal quantifier must be encoded into rules
- XQuery (query language for XML data) has it:

```
//country[.//city/population
          and
          (every $cp in .//city/population satisfies $cp > 1000000)]/name
```

- note: null values and missing values (in XML) have been ignored here.

TYPES OF KNOWLEDGE

- (positive) atomic facts:
  - DB: tuples in an n-column table of the database
  - FOL: $\mathcal{S} = (I, \mathcal{D})$: for an n-ary predicate, $I(p) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^n$
  - atoms in a formula

  $\Rightarrow$ conjunctions/sets of atomic facts
- negative atomic facts/knowledge:
  - rather "implicit": the n-tuples "not there" in a DB or not in $I(p)$.

  $\Rightarrow$ queries under CWA and $\mathcal{S} \models \varphi$.
- atomic positive conclusions: INSERT into DB, Views
- atomic negative conclusions: DELETE, or inconsistencies

Disjunctive Knowledge

- "$p(x)$ or $q(y)$ does hold"
- cannot be represented by a database or a single FOL interpretation, only by formulas

$\Rightarrow$ conclusions in "knowledge base"

Disjunctive Knowledge in Human Reasoning: Sudoku



Existential Knowledge

- "every country has some city that is its capital (and which is located in this country)"
  $\forall x$*:country(*x*)*$\rightarrow \exists y$*: (city(*y*)* $\wedge$ *hasCapital(*x, y*)* $\wedge$ *located_in(*y, x*))*
  - SQL: *country.capital* not null and a foreign-key-to-primary-key reference:
    country.(code, capital, capprov) references city.(country, name, province)
    only as a passive constraint, cannot conclude and insert the city (name is not known)
  - ER-Diagram: minCardinality for *capital*, but not that *isCapital* $\subseteq$ *locatedIn*
  - OWL/Description Logic: *Country* $\sqsubseteq \exists$ *hasCapital.City* and *isCapitalOf* $\sqsubseteq$ *locatedIn*
- "everything which is a parent has *some* child (which is a person)"
  ER Diagram: *Parent* is a subclass of *Person*, minCardinality of *hasChild* is 1
  OWL/Description Logic: *Parent* $\equiv \exists$*hasChild.Person*

  $\Leftarrow$: SQL: view, FOL: conclude an atom

  $\Rightarrow$: SQL: not possible
  FOL, e.g. tableau calculus use a skolem function and derive

  hasChild(alice, f_{child}*(alice))* and *Person(*f_{child}*(alice))*
- "every person has two parents which are persons"
  - would create/insert infinitely many new objects $\rightarrow$ needs a blocking strategy
  - in general, created objects may be equal or not (tableau calculus: $\rightarrow$ branching)