Notes on Practical Languages

Alice: What do you mean by practical languages?
Riccardo: select from where.
Alice: That’s it?
Vittorio: Well, there are of course lots of bells and whistles.
Sergio: But basically, this forms the core of most practical languages.

In this chapter we discuss the relationship of the abstract query languages discussed so far to three representative commercial relational query languages: Structured Query Language (SQL), Query-By-Example (QBE), and Microsoft Access. SQL is by far the dominant relational query language and provides the basis for languages in extensions of the relational model as well. Although QBE is less widespread, it illustrates nicely the basic capabilities and problems of graphic query languages. Access is a popular database management system for personal computers (PCs) and uses many elements of QBE.

Our discussion of the practical languages is not intended to provide a complete description of them, but rather to indicate some of the similarities and differences between theory and practice. We focus here on the central aspects of these languages. Many features, such as string-comparison operators, iteration, and embeddings into a host language, are not mentioned or are touched on only briefly.

We first present highlights of the three languages and then discuss considerations that arise from their use in the real world.

7.1 SQL: The Structured Query Language

SQL has emerged as the preeminent query language for mainframe and client-server relational dbms’s. This language combines the flavors of both the algebra and the calculus and is well suited for the specification of conjunctive queries.

This section begins by describing how conjunctive queries are expressed using SQL. We then progress to additional features, including nested queries and various forms of negation.

Conjunctive Queries in SQL

Although there are numerous variants of SQL, it has become the standard for relational query languages and indeed for most aspects of relational database access, including data definition, data modification, and view definition. SQL was originally developed under the
SQL: The Structured Query Language

name Sequel at the IBM San Jose Research Laboratory. It is currently supported by most of the dominant mainframe commercial relational systems, and increasingly by relational dbms's for PCs.

The basic building block of SQL queries is the select-from-where clause. Speaking loosely, these have the form

\[
\text{select} \quad \text{<list of fields to select>}
\]
\[
\text{from} \quad \text{<list of relation names>}
\]
\[
\text{where} \quad \text{<condition>}
\]

For example, queries (4.1) and (4.4) of Chapter 4 are expressed by

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{select} & \quad \text{Director} \\
\text{from} & \quad \text{Movies} \\
\text{where} & \quad \text{Title} = \text{‘Cries and Whispers’};
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{select} & \quad \text{Location.Theater, Address} \\
\text{from} & \quad \text{Movies, Location, Pariscope} \\
\text{where} & \quad \text{Director} = \text{‘Bergman’} \\
& \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Movies.Title} = \text{Pariscope.Title} \\
& \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Pariscope.Theater} = \text{Location.Theater};
\end{align*}
\]

In these queries, relation names themselves are used to denote variables ranging over tuples occurring in the corresponding relation. For example, in the preceding queries, the identifier Movies can be viewed as ranging over tuples in relation Movies. Relation name and attribute name pairs, such as Location.Theater, are used to refer to tuple components; and the relation name can be dropped if the attribute occurs in only one of the relations in the from clause.

The select keyword has the effect of the relational algebra projection operator, the from keyword has the effect of the cross-product operator, and the where keyword has the effect of the selection operator (see Exercise 7.3). For example, the second query translates to (using abbreviated attribute names)

\[
\pi_{L.Th, A} (\sigma_{D='Bergman'} \land M.Ti=P.Ti \land P.Th=L.Th} (\text{Movies} \times \text{Location} \times \text{Pariscope})).
\]

If all of the attributes mentioned in the from clause are to be output, then * can be used in place of an attribute list in the select clause. In general, the where condition may include conjunction, disjunction, negation, and (as will be seen shortly) nesting of select-from-where blocks. If the where clause is omitted, then it is viewed as having value true for all tuples of the cross-product. In implementations, as suggested in Chapter 6, optimizations will be used; for example, the from and where clauses will typically be merged to have the effect of an equi-join operator.

In SQL, as with most practical languages, duplicates may occur in a query answer.
Technically, then, the output of an SQL query may be a bag (also called “multiset”)—a collection whose members may occur more than once. This is a pragmatic compromise with the pure relational model because duplicate removal is rather expensive. The user may request that duplicates be removed by inserting the keyword `distinct` after the keyword `select`.

If more than one variable ranging over the same relation is needed, then variables can be introduced in the `from` clause. For example, query (4.7), which asks for pairs of persons such that the first directed the second and the second directed the first, can be expressed as

```sql
select M1.Director, M1.Actor
from Movies M1, Movies M2
where M1.Director = M2.Actor
    and M1.Actor = M2.Director;
```

In the preceding example, the `Director` coordinate of `M1` is compared with the `Actor` coordinate of `M2`. This is permitted because both coordinates are (presumably) of type `character string`. Relations are declared in SQL by specifying a relation name, the attribute names, and the scalar types associated with them. For example, the schema for `Movies` might be declared as

```sql
create table Movies
    (Title character[60],
     Director character[30],
     Actor character[30]);
```

In this case, `Title` and `Director` values would be comparable, even though they are character strings of different lengths. Other scalar types supported in SQL include integer, small integer, float, and date.

Although the select-from-where block of SQL has a syntactic flavor close to the relational calculus (but using tuple variables rather than domain variables), from a technical perspective the SQL semantics are firmly rooted in the algebra, as illustrated by the following example.

**Example 7.1.1** Let \{R[A], S[B], T[C]\} be a database schema, and consider the following query:

```sql
select \( A \)
from \( R, S, T \)
where \( R.A = S.B \) or \( R.A = T.C \);
```

A direct translation of this into the SPJR algebra extended to permit disjunction in selection formulas (see Exercise 4.22) yields
\[ \pi_A(\sigma_A = B \land A = C(R \times S \times T)), \]

which yields the empty answer if \( S \) is empty or if \( T \) is empty. Thus the foregoing SQL query is not equivalent to the calculus query:

\[ \{ x \mid R(x) \land (S(x) \lor T(x)) \}. \]

A correct translation into the conjunctive calculus (with disjunction) query is

\[ \{ w \mid \exists x, y, z(R(x) \land S(y) \land T(z) \land x = w \land (x = y \lor x = z)) \}. \]

\section*{Adding Set Operators}

The select-from-where blocks of SQL can be combined in a variety of ways. We describe first the incorporation of the set operators (union, intersect, and difference). For example, the query

\begin{equation}
(4.14) \quad \text{List all actors and director of the movie “Apocalypse Now.”}
\end{equation}

can be expressed as

\begin{verbatim}
(select  Actor Participant
from    Movies
where    Title = 'Apocalypse Now')
union
(select  Director Participant
from    Movies
where    Title = 'Apocalypse Now');
\end{verbatim}

In the first subquery the output relation uses attribute Participant in place of Actor. This illustrates renaming of attributes, analogous to relation variable renaming. This is needed here so that the two relations that are unioned have compatible sort.

Although union, intersect, and difference were all included in the original SQL, only union is in the current SQL2 standard developed by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI). The two left out can be simulated by other mechanisms, as will be seen later in this chapter.

SQL also includes a keyword contains, which can be used in a selection condition to test containment between the output of two nested select-from-where expressions.

\section*{Nested SQL Queries}

Nesting permits the use of one SQL query within the where clause of another. A simple illustration of nesting is given by this alternative formulation of query (4.4):
select Theater
from Pariscope
where Title in (select Title
from Movies
where Director = 'Bergman');

The preceding example tests membership of a unary tuple in a unary relation. The keyword `in` can also be used to test membership for arbitrary arities. The symbols `<` and `>` are used to construct tuples from attribute expressions. In addition, because negation is permitted in the `where` clause, set difference can be expressed. Consider the query

List title and theater for movies being shown in only one theater.

This can be expressed in SQL by

select Title, Theater
from Pariscope
where ⟨Title, Theater⟩ not in (select P1.Title, P1.Theater
from Pariscope P1, Pariscope P2
where P1.Title = P2.Title
and not (P1.Theater = P2.Theater));

Expressing First-Order Queries in SQL

We now discuss the important result that SQL is relationally “complete,” in the sense that it can express all relational queries expressible in the calculus. Recall from Chapter 5 that the family of nr-datalog¬ programs is equivalent to the calculus and algebra. We shall show how to simulate nr-datalog¬ using SQL. Intuitively, the result follows from the facts that

(a) each rule can be simulated using the `select-from-where` construct;
(b) multiple rules defining the same predicate can be simulated using `union`; and
(c) negation in rule bodies can be simulated using `not in`.

We present an example here and leave the formal proof for Exercise 7.4.

**Example 7.1.2** Consider the following query against the CINEMA database:

Find the theaters showing every movie directed by Hitchcock.

An nr-datalog¬ program expressing the query is
In the program, \( Bad_{th} \) holds the list of “bad” theaters, for which one can find a movie by Hitchcock that the theater is not showing. The last rule takes the complement of \( Bad_{th} \) with respect to the list of theaters provided by \( Location \).

An SQL query expressing an nr-datalog program such as this one can be constructed in two steps. The first is to write SQL queries for each rule separately. In this example, we have

\begin{align*}
&\text{Pariscope}^\prime(x_{th}, x_{title}) \leftarrow \text{Pariscope}(x_{th}, x_{title}, x_{sch}) \\
&\text{Bad}_{th}(x_{th}) \leftarrow \text{Movies}(x_{title}, \text{Hitchcock}, x_{act}) \\
&\text{Location}(x_{th}, x_{loc}, x_{ph}), \\
&\neg \text{Pariscope}^\prime(x_{th}, x_{title}) \\
&\text{Answer}(x_{th}) \leftarrow \text{Location}(x_{th}, x_{loc}, x_{ph}), \neg \text{Bad}_{th}(x_{th}).
\end{align*}

The second step is to combine the queries. In general, this involves replacing nested queries by their definitions, starting from the \textit{answer} relation and working backward. In this example, we have

\begin{align*}
&\text{Pariscope}^\prime: \quad \text{select} \quad \text{Theater, Title} \\
&\quad \text{from} \quad \text{Pariscope}; \\
&\text{Bad}_{th}: \quad \text{select} \quad \text{Theater} \\
&\quad \text{from} \quad \text{Movies, Location} \\
&\quad \text{where} \quad \text{Director} = \text{‘Hitchcock’} \\
&\quad \text{and} \quad (\text{Theater, Title}) \quad \text{not in} \\
&\quad \quad (\text{select} \quad \ast) \\
&\quad \quad \text{from} \quad \text{Pariscope}^\prime; \\
&\text{Answer}: \quad \text{select} \quad \text{Theater} \\
&\quad \text{from} \quad \text{Location} \\
&\quad \text{where} \quad \text{Theater} \quad \text{not in} \\
&\quad \quad (\text{select} \quad \ast) \\
&\quad \quad \text{from} \quad \text{Bad}_{th};
\end{align*}

select \quad \text{Theater} \\
from \quad \text{Location} \\
where \quad \text{Theater} \quad \text{not in} \\
\quad (\text{select} \quad \text{Theater} \\
\quad \text{from} \quad \text{Movies, Location} \\
\quad \text{where} \quad \text{Director} = \text{‘Hitchcock’} \\
\quad \text{and} \quad (\text{Theater, Title}) \quad \text{not in} \\
\quad \quad (\text{select} \quad \text{Theater, Title} \\
\quad \quad \text{from} \quad \text{Pariscope});

In this example, each \textit{idb} (see Section 4.3) relation that occurs in a rule body occurs
negatively. As a result, all variables that occur in the rule are bound by \textit{edb} relations, and so the \textit{from} part of the (possibly nested) query corresponding to the rule refers only to \textit{edb} relations. In general, however, variables in rule bodies might be bound by positively occurring \textit{idb} relations, which cannot be used in any \textit{from} clause in the final SQL query. To resolve this problem, the nr-datalog\textsuperscript{−} program should be rewritten so that all positively occurring relations in rule bodies are \textit{edb} relations (see Exercise 7.4a).

\textbf{View Creation and Updates}

We conclude our consideration of SQL by noting that it supports both view creation and updates.

SQL includes an explicit mechanism for view creation. The relation \textit{Champo-info} from Example 4.3.4 is created in SQL by

\begin{verbatim}
create view Le Champo as
  select Pariscope.Title, Schedule, Phone
  from Pariscope, Location
  where Pariscope.Theater = 'Le Champo'
    and Location.Theater = 'Le Champo.'
\end{verbatim}

Views in SQL can be accessed as can normal relations and are useful in building up complex queries.

As a practical database language, SQL provides commands for updating the database. We briefly illustrate these here; some theoretical aspects concerning updates are presented in Chapter 22.

SQL provides three primitive commands for modifying the contents of a database—\textbf{insert}, \textbf{delete}, and \textbf{update} (in the sense of modifying individual tuples of a relation).

The following can be used to insert a new tuple into the \textit{Movies} database:

\begin{verbatim}
insert into Movies
  values ('Apocalypse Now,' 'Coppola,' 'Duvall');
\end{verbatim}

A set of tuples can be deleted simultaneously:

\begin{verbatim}
delete Movies
  where Director = 'Hitchcock';
\end{verbatim}

Tuple update can also operate on sets of tuples (as illustrated by the following) that might be used to correct a typographical error:

\begin{verbatim}
update Movies
  set Director = 'Hitchcock'
  where Director = 'Hickcook';
\end{verbatim}
The ability to insert and delete tuples provides an alternative approach to demonstrating the relational completeness of SQL. In particular, subexpressions of an algebra expression can be computed in intermediate, temporary relations (see Exercise 7.6). This approach does not allow the same degree of optimization as the one based on views because the SQL interpreter is required to materialize each of the intermediate relations.

### 7.2 Query-by-Example and Microsoft Access

We now turn to two query languages that have a more visual presentation. The first, Query-by-Example (QBE), presents a visual display for expressing conjunctive queries that is close to the perspective of tableau queries. The second language, Access, is available on personal computers; it uses elements of QBE, but with a more graphical presentation of join relationships.

#### QBE

The language Query-By-Example (QBE) was originally developed at the IBM T. J. Watson Research Center and is currently supported as part of IBM’s Query Management Facility. As illustrated at the beginning of Chapter 4, the basic format of QBE queries is fundamentally two-dimensional and visually close to the tableau queries. Importantly, a variety of features are incorporated into QBE to give more expressive power than the tableau queries and to provide data manipulation capabilities. We now indicate some features that can be incorporated into a QBE-like visual framework. The semantics presented here are a slight variation of the semantics supported for QBE in IBM’s product line.

As seen in Fig. 4.2, which expresses query (4.4), QBE uses strings with prefix _ to denote variables and other strings to denote constants. If the string is preceded by P, then the associated coordinate value forms part of the query output. QBE framework can provide a partial union capability by permitting the inclusion in a query of multiple tuples having a P prefix in a single relation. For example, Fig. 7.1 expresses the query

\[(4.12)\] What films with Allen as actor or director are currently featured at the Concorde?

Under one natural semantics for QBE queries, which parallels the semantics of conjunctive queries and of SQL, this query will yield the empty answer if either \(\sigma_{\text{Director}=\text{Allen}}\) \(\text{Movies}\) or \(\sigma_{\text{Actor}=\text{Allen}}\) \(\text{Movies}\) is empty (see Example 7.1.1).

QBE also includes a capability of *condition boxes*, which can be viewed as an extension of the incorporation of equality atoms into tableau queries.

QBE does not provide a mechanism analogous to SQL for nesting of queries. It is hard to develop an appropriate visual representation of such nesting within the QBE framework, in part due to the lack of scoping rules. More recent extensions of QBE address this issue by incorporating, for example, hierarchical windows. QBE also provides mechanisms for both view definition and database update.

Negation can be incorporated into QBE queries in a variety of ways. The use of database update is an obvious mechanism, although not especially efficient. Two restricted
forms of negation are illustrated in Fig. 7.2, which expresses the following query: (assuming that each film has only one director) what theaters, other than the Concorde, feature a film not directed by Bergman? The $\neg$ in the Pariscope relation restricts attention to those tuples with Theater coordinate not equal to Concorde, and the $\neg$ preceding the tuple in the Movies relation is analogous to a negative literal in a datalog rule and captures a limited form of $\neg \exists$ from the calculus; in this case it excludes all films directed by Bergman. When such negation is used, it is required that all variables that occur in a row preceded by $\neg$ also appear in positive rows. Other restricted forms of negation in QBE include using negative literals in condition boxes and supporting an operator analogous to relational division (as defined in Exercise 5.8).

The following example shows more generally how view definition can be used to obtain relational completeness.

**Example 7.2.1** Recall the query and nr-datalog$^\neg$ program of Example 7.1.2. As with SQL, the QBE query corresponding to an nr-datalog$^\neg$ will involve one or more views for each rule (see Exercise 7.5). For this example, however, it turns out that we can compute the effect of the first two rules with a single QBE query. Thus the two stages of the full query are shown in Fig. 7.3, where the symbol I. indicates that the associated tuples are to be inserted into the answer. The creation of the view Bad_th is accomplished using the
Microsoft Access: A Query Language for PCs

A number of dbms’s for personal computers have become available over the past few years, such as DBASE IV, Microsoft Access, Foxpro, and Paradox. Several of these support a version of SQL and a more visual query language. The visual languages have a flavor somewhat different from QBE. We illustrate this here by presenting an example of a query from the Microsoft Access dbm’s.

Access provides an elegant graphical mechanism for constructing conjunctive queries. This includes a tabular display to indicate the form and content of desired output tuples, the use of single-attribute conditions within this display (in the rows named “Criteria” and “or”), and a graphical presentation of join relationships that are to hold between relations used to form the output. Fig. 7.4 shows how query (4.4) can be expressed using Access.
Figure 7.4: Example query in Access

(Although not shown in the figure, join conditions can also be expressed using single-attribute conditions represented as text.)

Limited forms of negation and union can be incorporated into the condition part of an Access query. For more general forms of negation and union, however, the technique of building views to serve as intermediate relations can be used.

7.3 Confronting the Real World

Because they are to be used in practical situations, the languages presented in this chapter incorporate a number of features not included in their formal counterparts. In this section we touch on some of these extensions and on fundamental issues raised by them. These include domain independence, the implications of incorporating many-sorted atomic objects, the use of arithmetic, and the incorporation of aggregate operators.

Queries from all of the practical languages described in this chapter are domain independent. This is easily verified from the form of queries in these languages: Whenever a variable is introduced, the relation it ranges over is also specified. Furthermore, the specific semantics associated with or’s occurring in where clauses (see Example 7.1.1) prevent the kind of safety problem illustrated by query unsafe-2 of Section 5.3.

Most practical languages permit the underlying domain of values to be many-sorted—for example, including distinct scalar domains for the types integer, real, character string, etc., and some constructed types, such as date, in some languages. (More recent systems, such as POSTGRES, permit the user to incorporate abstract data types as well.) For most of the theoretical treatment, we assumed that there was one underlying domain of values, dom, which was shared equally by all relational attributes. As noted in the discussion of
SQL, the typing of attributes can be used to ensure that comparisons make sense, in that they compare values of comparable type. Much of the theory developed here for a single underlying domain can be generalized to the case of a many-sorted underlying domain (see Exercise 7.8).

Another fundamental feature of practical query languages is that they offer value comparators other than equality. Typically most of the base sorts are totally ordered. This is the case for the integers or the strings (under the lexicographical ordering). It is therefore natural to introduce $\leq$, $\geq$, $<$, $>$ as comparators. For example, to ask the query, “What can we see at the Le Champo after 21:00,” we can use

\[
\text{ans}(x_t) \leftarrow \text{Pariscope}(\text{“Le Champo,”}x_t,x_s), x_s > \text{“}21:00\text{”};
\]

and, in the algebra, as

\[
\pi_{\text{Title}}(\sigma_{\text{Theater} = \text{“Le Champo”}} \land \text{Schedule} > \text{“}21:00\text{”} \cdot \text{Pariscope}).
\]

Exercise 4.30 explores the impact of incorporating comparators into the conjunctive queries. Many languages also incorporate string-comparison operators.

Given the presence of integers and reals, it is natural to incorporate arithmetic operators. This yields a fundamental increase in expressive power: Even simple counting is beyond the power of the calculus (see Exercise 5.34).

Another extension concerns the incorporation of aggregate operators into the practical languages (see Section 5.5). Consider, for example, the query, “How many films did Hitchcock direct?”. In SQL, this can be expressed using the query

\[
\text{select } \text{count(distinct Title)} \text{ from Movies where Director = ‘Hitchcock’;}
\]

(The keyword distinct is needed here, because otherwise SQL will not remove duplicates from the projection onto Title.) Other aggregate operators typically supported in practical languages include sum, average, minimum, and maximum.

In the preceding example, the aggregate operator was applied to an entire relation. By using the group by command, aggregate operators can be applied to clusters of tuples, each common values on a specified set of attributes. For example, the following SQL query determines the number of movies directed by each director:

\[
\text{select Director, count(distinct Title) from Movies group by Director;}
\]

The semantics of group by in SQL are most easily understood when we study an extension of the relational model, called the complex object (or nested relation) model, which models grouping in a natural fashion (see Chapter 20).
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Exercises

Exercise 7.1 Write SQL, QBE, and Access queries expressing queries (4.1 to 4.14) from Chapter 4. Start by expressing them as nr-datalog¬ programs.

Exercise 7.2 Consider again the queries (5.2 and 5.3) of Chapter 5. Express these in SQL, QBE, and Access.

Exercise 7.3 Describe formally the mapping of SQL select-from-where blocks into the SPJR algebra.

Exercise 7.4

(a) Let P be an nr-datalog¬ program. Describe how to construct an equivalent program P′ such that each predicate that occurs positively in a rule body is an edb predicate.

(b) Develop a formal proof that SQL can simulate nr-datalog¬.

Exercise 7.5 Following Example 7.2.1, show that QBE is relationally complete.

Exercise 7.6

(a) Assuming that R and S have compatible sorts, show how to compute in SQL the value of R − S into the relation T using insert and delete.

(b) Generalize this to show that SQL is relationally complete.
Exercise 7.7  In a manner analogous to Exercise 7.6, show that Access is relationally complete.

★ Exercise 7.8  The intuition behind the typed restricted PSJ algebra is that each attribute has a distinct type whose elements are incomparable with the types of other attributes. As motivated by the practical query languages, propose and study a restriction of the SPJR algebra analogous to the typed restricted PSJ algebra, but permitting more than one attribute with the same type. Does the equivalence of the various versions of the conjunctive queries still hold? Can Exercise 6.21 be generalized to this framework?