Codd proposed the relational data model in 1970. At that time most database systems were based on one of two older data models (the hierarchical model and the network model); the relational model revolutionized the database field and largely supplanted these earlier models. Prototype relational database management systems were developed in pioneering research projects at IBM and UC-Berkeley by the mid-70s, and several vendors were offering relational database products shortly thereafter. Today, the relational model is by far the dominant data model and is the foundation for the leading DBMS products, including IBM’s DB2 family, Informix, Oracle, Sybase, Microsoft’s Access and SQLServer, FoxBase, and Paradox. Relational database systems are ubiquitous in the marketplace and represent a multibillion dollar industry.

The relational model is very simple and elegant; a database is a collection of one or more relations, where each relation is a table with rows and columns. This simple tabular representation enables even novice users to understand the contents of a database, and it permits the use of simple, high-level languages to query the data. The major advantages of the relational model over the older data models are its simple data representation and the ease with which even complex queries can be expressed.

This chapter introduces the relational model and covers the following issues:

- How is data represented?
- What kinds of integrity constraints can be expressed?
- How can data be created and modified?
- How can data be manipulated and queried?
- How do we obtain a database design in the relational model?
- How are logical and physical data independence achieved?
**SQL**: It was the query language of the pioneering System-R relational DBMS developed at IBM. Over the years, SQL has become the most widely used language for creating, manipulating, and querying relational DBMSs. Since many vendors offer SQL products, there is a need for a standard that defines ‘official SQL.’ The existence of a standard allows users to measure a given vendor’s version of SQL for completeness. It also allows users to distinguish SQL features that are specific to one product from those that are standard; an application that relies on non-standard features is less portable.

The first SQL standard was developed in 1986 by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), and was called SQL-86. There was a minor revision in 1989 called SQL-89, and a major revision in 1992 called SQL-92. The International Standards Organization (ISO) collaborated with ANSI to develop SQL-92. Most commercial DBMSs currently support SQL-92. An exciting development is the imminent approval of SQL:1999, a major extension of SQL-92. While the coverage of SQL in this book is based upon SQL-92, we will cover the main extensions of SQL:1999 as well.

While we concentrate on the underlying concepts, we also introduce the **Data Definition Language (DDL)** features of SQL-92, the standard language for creating, manipulating, and querying data in a relational DBMS. This allows us to ground the discussion firmly in terms of real database systems.

We discuss the concept of a relation in Section 3.1 and show how to create relations using the SQL language. An important component of a data model is the set of constructs it provides for specifying conditions that must be satisfied by the data. Such conditions, called **integrity constraints** (ICs), enable the DBMS to reject operations that might corrupt the data. We present integrity constraints in the relational model in Section 3.2, along with a discussion of SQL support for ICs. We discuss how a DBMS enforces integrity constraints in Section 3.3. In Section 3.4 we turn to the mechanism for accessing and retrieving data from the database, **query languages**, and introduce the querying features of SQL, which we examine in greater detail in a later chapter.

We then discuss the step of converting an ER diagram into a relational database schema in Section 3.5. Finally, we introduce **views**, or tables defined using queries, in Section 3.6. Views can be used to define the external schema for a database and thus provide the support for logical data independence in the relational model.

## 3.1 Introduction to the Relational Model

The main construct for representing data in the relational model is a **relation**. A relation consists of a **relation schema** and a **relation instance**. The relation instance...
is a table, and the relation schema describes the column heads for the table. We first
describe the relation schema and then the relation instance. The schema specifies the
relation’s name, the name of each field (or column, or attribute), and the domain
of each field. A domain is referred to in a relation schema by the domain name and
has a set of associated values.

We use the example of student information in a university database from Chapter 1
to illustrate the parts of a relation schema:

Students(sid: string, name: string, login: string, age: integer, gpa: real)

This says, for instance, that the field named sid has a domain named string. The set
of values associated with domain string is the set of all character strings.

We now turn to the instances of a relation. An instance of a relation is a set of
tuples, also called records, in which each tuple has the same number of fields as the
relation schema. A relation instance can be thought of as a table in which each tuple
is a row, and all rows have the same number of fields. (The term relation instance is
often abbreviated to just relation, when there is no confusion with other aspects of a
relation such as its schema.)

An instance of the Students relation appears in Figure 3.1. The instance S1 contains

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50000</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>dave@cs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53666</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>jones@cs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53688</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53650</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53831</td>
<td>Madayan</td>
<td>madayan@music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53832</td>
<td>Guldu</td>
<td>guldu@music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 An Instance S1 of the Students Relation

six tuples and has, as we expect from the schema, five fields. Note that no two rows
are identical. This is a requirement of the relational model—each relation is defined
to be a set of unique tuples or rows. The order in which the rows are listed is not
important. Figure 3.2 shows the same relation instance. If the fields are named, as in

\footnote{In practice, commercial systems allow tables to have duplicate rows, but we will assume that a
relation is indeed a set of tuples unless otherwise noted.}
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53831</td>
<td>Madayan</td>
<td>madayan@music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53832</td>
<td>Guldu</td>
<td>guldu@music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53688</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53650</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53666</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>jones@cs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50000</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>dave@cs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.2 An Alternative Representation of Instance $S_1$ of Students

Our schema definitions and figures depicting relation instances, the order of fields does not matter either. However, an alternative convention is to list fields in a specific order and to refer to a field by its position. Thus $sid$ is field 1 of Students, $login$ is field 3, and so on. If this convention is used, the order of fields is significant. Most database systems use a combination of these conventions. For example, in SQL the named fields convention is used in statements that retrieve tuples, and the ordered fields convention is commonly used when inserting tuples.

A relation schema specifies the domain of each field or column in the relation instance. These domain constraints in the schema specify an important condition that we want each instance of the relation to satisfy: The values that appear in a column must be drawn from the domain associated with that column. Thus, the domain of a field is essentially the type of that field, in programming language terms, and restricts the values that can appear in the field.

More formally, let $R(f_1:D_1, \ldots, f_n:D_n)$ be a relation schema, and for each $f_i$, $1 \leq i \leq n$, let $Dom_i$ be the set of values associated with the domain named $D_i$. An instance of $R$ that satisfies the domain constraints in the schema is a set of tuples with $n$ fields:

$$\{ (f_1 : d_1, \ldots, f_n : d_n) \mid d_1 \in Dom_1, \ldots, d_n \in Dom_n \}$$

The angular brackets $(\ldots)$ identify the fields of a tuple. Using this notation, the first Students tuple shown in Figure 3.1 is written as $(sid: 50000, name: Dave, login: dave@cs, age: 19, gpa: 3.3)$. The curly brackets $\{\ldots\}$ denote a set (of tuples, in this definition). The vertical bar $|$ should be read ‘such that,’ the symbol $\in$ should be read ‘in,’ and the expression to the right of the vertical bar is a condition that must be satisfied by the field values of each tuple in the set. Thus, an instance of $R$ is defined as a set of tuples. The fields of each tuple must correspond to the fields in the relation schema.

Domain constraints are so fundamental in the relational model that we will henceforth consider only relation instances that satisfy them; therefore, relation instance means relation instance that satisfies the domain constraints in the relation schema.
The **degree**, also called **arity**, of a relation is the number of fields. The **cardinality** of a relation instance is the number of tuples in it. In Figure 3.1, the degree of the relation (the number of columns) is five, and the cardinality of this instance is six.

A **relational database** is a collection of relations with distinct relation names. The **relational database schema** is the collection of schemas for the relations in the database. For example, in Chapter 1, we discussed a university database with relations called Students, Faculty, Courses, Rooms, Enrolled, Teaches, and Meets_In. An **instance** of a relational database is a collection of relation instances, one per relation schema in the database schema; of course, each relation instance must satisfy the domain constraints in its schema.

### 3.1.1 Creating and Modifying Relations Using SQL-92

The SQL-92 language standard uses the word *table* to denote *relation*, and we will often follow this convention when discussing SQL. The subset of SQL that supports the creation, deletion, and modification of tables is called the **Data Definition Language (DDL)**. Further, while there is a command that lets users define new domains, analogous to type definition commands in a programming language, we postpone a discussion of domain definition until Section 5.11. For now, we will just consider domains that are built-in types, such as **integer**.

The **CREATE TABLE** statement is used to define a new table.² To create the Students relation, we can use the following statement:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Students ( sid CHAR(20),
                        name CHAR(30),
                        login CHAR(20),
                        age INTEGER,
                        gpa REAL )
```

Tuples are inserted using the **INSERT** command. We can insert a single tuple into the Students table as follows:

```sql
INSERT INTO Students (sid, name, login, age, gpa)
VALUES (53688, ‘Smith’, ‘smith@ee’, 18, 3.2)
```

We can optionally omit the list of column names in the **INTO** clause and list the values in the appropriate order, but it is good style to be explicit about column names.

---

²SQL also provides statements to destroy tables and to change the columns associated with a table; we discuss these in Section 3.7.
We can delete tuples using the **DELETE** command. We can delete all Students tuples with *name* equal to Smith using the command:

```
DELETE
FROM Students S
WHERE S.name = 'Smith'
```

We can modify the column values in an existing row using the **UPDATE** command. For example, we can increment the age and decrement the gpa of the student with *sid* 53688:

```
UPDATE Students S
SET S.age = S.age + 1, S.gpa = S.gpa - 1
WHERE S.sid = 53688
```

These examples illustrate some important points. The **WHERE** clause is applied first and determines which rows are to be modified. The **SET** clause then determines how these rows are to be modified. If the column that is being modified is also used to determine the new value, the value used in the expression on the right side of equals (=) is the *old* value, that is, before the modification. To illustrate these points further, consider the following variation of the previous query:

```
UPDATE Students S
SET S.gpa = S.gpa - 0.1
WHERE S.gpa > 3.3
```

If this query is applied on the instance *S1* of Students shown in Figure 3.1, we obtain the instance shown in Figure 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50000</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>dave@cs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53666</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>jones@cs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53688</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53650</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53831</td>
<td>Madayan</td>
<td>madayan@music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53832</td>
<td>Guldu</td>
<td>guldu@music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.3** Students Instance *S1* after Update

### 3.2 INTegrity CONSTRAINTS OVER RELATIONS

A database is only as good as the information stored in it, and a DBMS must therefore help prevent the entry of incorrect information. An **integrity constraint** (IC) is a
Integrity constraints are specified and enforced at different times:

1. When the DBA or end user defines a database schema, he or she specifies the ICs that must hold on any instance of this database.

2. When a database application is run, the DBMS checks for violations and disallows changes to the data that violate the specified ICs. (In some situations, rather than disallow the change, the DBMS might instead make some compensating changes to the data to ensure that the database instance satisfies all ICs. In any case, changes to the database are not allowed to create an instance that violates any IC.)

Many kinds of integrity constraints can be specified in the relational model. We have already seen one example of an integrity constraint in the domain constraints associated with a relation schema (Section 3.1). In general, other kinds of constraints can be specified as well; for example, no two students have the same sid value. In this section we discuss the integrity constraints, other than domain constraints, that a DBA or user can specify in the relational model.

### 3.2.1 Key Constraints

Consider the Students relation and the constraint that no two students have the same student id. This IC is an example of a key constraint. A key constraint is a statement that a certain minimal subset of the fields of a relation is a unique identifier for a tuple. A set of fields that uniquely identifies a tuple according to a key constraint is called a candidate key for the relation; we often abbreviate this to just key. In the case of the Students relation, the (set of fields containing just the) sid field is a candidate key.

Let us take a closer look at the above definition of a (candidate) key. There are two parts to the definition:

1. Two distinct tuples in a legal instance (an instance that satisfies all ICs, including the key constraint) cannot have identical values in all the fields of a key.

2. No subset of the set of fields in a key is a unique identifier for a tuple.

---

3The term key is rather overworked. In the context of access methods, we speak of search keys, which are quite different.
The first part of the definition means that in any legal instance, the values in the key fields uniquely identify a tuple in the instance. When specifying a key constraint, the DBA or user must be sure that this constraint will not prevent them from storing a ‘correct’ set of tuples. (A similar comment applies to the specification of other kinds of ICs as well.) The notion of ‘correctness’ here depends upon the nature of the data being stored. For example, several students may have the same name, although each student has a unique student id. If the name field is declared to be a key, the DBMS will not allow the Students relation to contain two tuples describing different students with the same name!

The second part of the definition means, for example, that the set of fields \(\{\text{sid, name}\}\) is not a key for Students, because this set properly contains the key \(\{\text{sid}\}\). The set \(\{\text{sid, name}\}\) is an example of a superkey, which is a set of fields that contains a key.

Look again at the instance of the Students relation in Figure 3.1. Observe that two different rows always have different sid values; sid is a key and uniquely identifies a tuple. However, this does not hold for nonkey fields. For example, the relation contains two rows with Smith in the name field.

Note that every relation is guaranteed to have a key. Since a relation is a set of tuples, the set of all fields is always a superkey. If other constraints hold, some subset of the fields may form a key, but if not, the set of all fields is a key.

A relation may have several candidate keys. For example, the login and age fields of the Students relation may, taken together, also identify students uniquely. That is, \(\{\text{login, age}\}\) is also a key. It may seem that login is a key, since no two rows in the example instance have the same login value. However, the key must identify tuples uniquely in all possible legal instances of the relation. By stating that \(\{\text{login, age}\}\) is a key, the user is declaring that two students may have the same login or age, but not both.

Out of all the available candidate keys, a database designer can identify a primary key. Intuitively, a tuple can be referred to from elsewhere in the database by storing the values of its primary key fields. For example, we can refer to a Students tuple by storing its sid value. As a consequence of referring to student tuples in this manner, tuples are frequently accessed by specifying their sid value. In principle, we can use any key, not just the primary key, to refer to a tuple. However, using the primary key is preferable because it is what the DBMS expects—this is the significance of designating a particular candidate key as a primary key—and optimizes for. For example, the DBMS may create an index with the primary key fields as the search key, to make the retrieval of a tuple given its primary key value efficient. The idea of referring to a tuple is developed further in the next section.
Specifying Key Constraints in SQL-92

In SQL we can declare that a subset of the columns of a table constitute a key by using the UNIQUE constraint. At most one of these ‘candidate’ keys can be declared to be a primary key, using the PRIMARY KEY constraint. (SQL does not require that such constraints be declared for a table.)

Let us revisit our example table definition and specify key information:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Students ( sid CHAR(20),
                        name CHAR(30),
                        login CHAR(20),
                        age INTEGER,
                        gpa REAL,
                        UNIQUE (name, age),
                        CONSTRAINT StudentsKey PRIMARY KEY (sid) )
```

This definition says that `sid` is the primary key and that the combination of `name` and `age` is also a key. The definition of the primary key also illustrates how we can name a constraint by preceding it with `CONSTRAINT constraint-name`. If the constraint is violated, the constraint name is returned and can be used to identify the error.

3.2.2 Foreign Key Constraints

Sometimes the information stored in a relation is linked to the information stored in another relation. If one of the relations is modified, the other must be checked, and perhaps modified, to keep the data consistent. An IC involving both relations must be specified if a DBMS is to make such checks. The most common IC involving two relations is a foreign key constraint.

Suppose that in addition to Students, we have a second relation:

```sql
Enrolled(sid: string, cid: string, grade: string)
```

To ensure that only bona fide students can enroll in courses, any value that appears in the `sid` field of an instance of the Enrolled relation should also appear in the `sid` field of some tuple in the Students relation. The `sid` field of Enrolled is called a foreign key and refers to Students. The foreign key in the referencing relation (Enrolled, in our example) must match the primary key of the referenced relation (Students), i.e., it must have the same number of columns and compatible data types, although the column names can be different.

This constraint is illustrated in Figure 3.4. As the figure shows, there may well be some students who are not referenced from Enrolled (e.g., the student with `sid=50000`).
However, every sid value that appears in the instance of the Enrolled table appears in the primary key column of a row in the Students table.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 3.4** Referential Integrity

If we try to insert the tuple \(\langle 55555, \text{Art104}, A \rangle\) into \(E_1\), the IC is violated because there is no tuple in \(S_1\) with the id 55555; the database system should reject such an insertion. Similarly, if we delete the tuple \(\langle 53666, \text{Jones}, \text{jones@cs}, 18, 3.4 \rangle\) from \(S_1\), we violate the foreign key constraint because the tuple \(\langle 53666, \text{History105}, B \rangle\) in \(E_1\) contains sid value 53666, the sid of the deleted Students tuple. The DBMS should disallow the deletion or, perhaps, also delete the Enrolled tuple that refers to the deleted Students tuple. We discuss foreign key constraints and their impact on updates in Section 3.3.

Finally, we note that a foreign key could refer to the same relation. For example, we could extend the Students relation with a column called partner and declare this column to be a foreign key referring to Students. Intuitively, every student could then have a partner, and the partner field contains the partner’s sid. The observant reader will no doubt ask, “What if a student does not (yet) have a partner?” This situation is handled in SQL by using a special value called null. The use of null in a field of a tuple means that value in that field is either unknown or not applicable (e.g., we do not know the partner yet, or there is no partner). The appearance of null in a foreign key field does not violate the foreign key constraint. However, null values are not allowed to appear in a primary key field (because the primary key fields are used to identify a tuple uniquely). We will discuss null values further in Chapter 5.

**Specifying Foreign Key Constraints in SQL-92**

Let us define Enrolled\((sid: \text{string}, cid: \text{string}, grade: \text{string}\)):

\[
\text{CREATE TABLE Enrolled ( sid CHAR(20),}
\]

The foreign key constraint states that every sid value in Enrolled must also appear in Students, that is, sid in Enrolled is a foreign key referencing Students. Incidentally, the primary key constraint states that a student has exactly one grade for each course that he or she is enrolled in. If we want to record more than one grade per student per course, we should change the primary key constraint.

### 3.2.3 General Constraints

Domain, primary key, and foreign key constraints are considered to be a fundamental part of the relational data model and are given special attention in most commercial systems. Sometimes, however, it is necessary to specify more general constraints.

For example, we may require that student ages be within a certain range of values; given such an IC specification, the DBMS will reject inserts and updates that violate the constraint. This is very useful in preventing data entry errors. If we specify that all students must be at least 16 years old, the instance of Students shown in Figure 3.1 is illegal because two students are underage. If we disallow the insertion of these two tuples, we have a legal instance, as shown in Figure 3.5.

![Table](https://example.com/table.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53666</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>jones@cs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53688</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53650</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.5** An Instance S2 of the Students Relation

The IC that students must be older than 16 can be thought of as an extended domain constraint, since we are essentially defining the set of permissible age values more stringently than is possible by simply using a standard domain such as integer. In general, however, constraints that go well beyond domain, key, or foreign key constraints can be specified. For example, we could require that every student whose age is greater than 18 must have a gpa greater than 3.

Current relational database systems support such general constraints in the form of table constraints and assertions. Table constraints are associated with a single table and are checked whenever that table is modified. In contrast, assertions involve several
tables and are checked whenever any of these tables is modified. Both table constraints and assertions can use the full power of SQL queries to specify the desired restriction. We discuss SQL support for table constraints and assertions in Section 5.11 because a full appreciation of their power requires a good grasp of SQL’s query capabilities.

3.3 ENFORCING INTEGRITY CONSTRAINTS

As we observed earlier, ICs are specified when a relation is created and enforced when a relation is modified. The impact of domain, PRIMARY KEY, and UNIQUE constraints is straightforward: if an insert, delete, or update command causes a violation, it is rejected. Potential IC violation is generally checked at the end of each SQL statement execution, although it can be deferred until the end of the transaction executing the statement, as we will see in Chapter 18.

Consider the instance \( S_1 \) of Students shown in Figure 3.1. The following insertion violates the primary key constraint because there is already a tuple with the \( sid \) 53688, and it will be rejected by the DBMS:

```sql
INSERT INTO Students (sid, name, login, age, gpa)
VALUES (53688, 'Mike', 'mike@ee', 17, 3.4)
```

The following insertion violates the constraint that the primary key cannot contain null:

```sql
INSERT INTO Students (sid, name, login, age, gpa)
VALUES (null, 'Mike', 'mike@ee', 17, 3.4)
```

Of course, a similar problem arises whenever we try to insert a tuple with a value in a field that is not in the domain associated with that field, i.e., whenever we violate a domain constraint. Deletion does not cause a violation of domain, primary key or unique constraints. However, an update can cause violations, similar to an insertion:

```sql
UPDATE Students S
SET S.sid = 50000
WHERE S.sid = 53688
```

This update violates the primary key constraint because there is already a tuple with \( sid \) 50000.

The impact of foreign key constraints is more complex because SQL sometimes tries to rectify a foreign key constraint violation instead of simply rejecting the change. We will
discuss the **referential integrity enforcement steps** taken by the DBMS in terms of our Enrolled and Students tables, with the foreign key constraint that Enrolled.sid is a reference to (the primary key of) Students.

In addition to the instance $S_1$ of Students, consider the instance of Enrolled shown in Figure 3.4. Deletions of Enrolled tuples do not violate referential integrity, but insertions of Enrolled tuples could. The following insertion is illegal because there is no student with sid 51111:

```sql
INSERT INTO Enrolled (cid, grade, sid)
VALUES ('Hindi101', 'B', 51111)
```

On the other hand, insertions of Students tuples do not violate referential integrity although deletions could. Further, updates on either Enrolled or Students that change the sid value could potentially violate referential integrity.

SQL-92 provides several alternative ways to handle foreign key violations. We must consider three basic questions:

1. **What should we do if an Enrolled row is inserted, with a sid column value that does not appear in any row of the Students table?**
   In this case the `INSERT` command is simply rejected.

2. **What should we do if a Students row is deleted?**
   The options are:
   - Delete all Enrolled rows that refer to the deleted Students row.
   - Disallow the deletion of the Students row if an Enrolled row refers to it.
   - Set the sid column to the sid of some (existing) ‘default’ student, for every Enrolled row that refers to the deleted Students row.
   - For every Enrolled row that refers to it, set the sid column to null. In our example, this option conflicts with the fact that sid is part of the primary key of Enrolled and therefore cannot be set to null. Thus, we are limited to the first three options in our example, although this fourth option (setting the foreign key to null) is available in the general case.

3. **What should we do if the primary key value of a Students row is updated?**
   The options here are similar to the previous case.

SQL-92 allows us to choose any of the four options on `DELETE` and `UPDATE`. For example, we can specify that when a Students row is deleted, all Enrolled rows that refer to it are to be deleted as well, but that when the sid column of a Students row is modified, this update is to be rejected if an Enrolled row refers to the modified Students row:
CREATE TABLE Enrolled ( sid CHAR(20),
    cid CHAR(20),
    grade CHAR(10),
    PRIMARY KEY (sid, cid),
    FOREIGN KEY (sid) REFERENCES Students
        ON DELETE CASCADE
        ON UPDATE NO ACTION )

The options are specified as part of the foreign key declaration. The default option is \textbf{NO ACTION}, which means that the action (\texttt{DELETE} or \texttt{UPDATE}) is to be rejected. Thus, the \texttt{ON UPDATE} clause in our example could be omitted, with the same effect. The \texttt{CASCADE} keyword says that if a Students row is deleted, all Enrolled rows that refer to it are to be deleted as well. If the \texttt{UPDATE} clause specified \texttt{CASCADE}, and the \texttt{sid} column of a Students row is updated, this update is also carried out in each Enrolled row that refers to the updated Students row.

If a Students row is deleted, we can switch the enrollment to a ‘default’ student by using \texttt{ON DELETE SET DEFAULT}. The default student is specified as part of the definition of the \texttt{sid} field in Enrolled; for example, \texttt{sid CHAR(20) DEFAULT ‘53666’}. Although the specification of a default value is appropriate in some situations (e.g., a default parts supplier if a particular supplier goes out of business), it is really not appropriate to switch enrollments to a default student. The correct solution in this example is to also delete all enrollment tuples for the deleted student (that is, \texttt{CASCADE}), or to reject the update.

SQL also allows the use of \texttt{null} as the default value by specifying \texttt{ON DELETE SET NULL}.

3.4 QUERYING RELATIONAL DATA

A relational database \textit{query} (query, for short) is a question about the data, and the answer consists of a new relation containing the result. For example, we might want to find all students younger than 18 or all students enrolled in Reggae203. A \textit{query language} is a specialized language for writing queries.

SQL is the most popular commercial query language for a relational DBMS. We now present some SQL examples that illustrate how easily relations can be queried. Consider the instance of the Students relation shown in Figure 3.1. We can retrieve rows corresponding to students who are younger than 18 with the following SQL query:

\begin{verbatim}
SELECT *
FROM Students S
WHERE S.age < 18
\end{verbatim}
The symbol * means that we retain all fields of selected tuples in the result. To understand this query, think of S as a variable that takes on the value of each tuple in Students, one tuple after the other. The condition \( S.age < 18 \) in the WHERE clause specifies that we want to select only tuples in which the age field has a value less than 18. This query evaluates to the relation shown in Figure 3.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53831</td>
<td>Madyan</td>
<td>madayan@music</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53832</td>
<td>Guldu</td>
<td>guldu@music</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.6 Students with age < 18 on Instance S1

This example illustrates that the domain of a field restricts the operations that are permitted on field values, in addition to restricting the values that can appear in the field. The condition \( S.age < 18 \) involves an arithmetic comparison of an age value with an integer and is permissible because the domain of age is the set of integers. On the other hand, a condition such as \( S.age = S.sid \) does not make sense because it compares an integer value with a string value, and this comparison is defined to fail in SQL; a query containing this condition will produce no answer tuples.

In addition to selecting a subset of tuples, a query can extract a subset of the fields of each selected tuple. We can compute the names and logins of students who are younger than 18 with the following query:

\[
\text{SELECT } S\text{.name, } S\text{.login} \\
\text{FROM Students } S \\
\text{WHERE } S\text{.age} < 18
\]

Figure 3.7 shows the answer to this query; it is obtained by applying the selection to the instance S1 of Students (to get the relation shown in Figure 3.6), followed by removing unwanted fields. Note that the order in which we perform these operations does matter—if we remove unwanted fields first, we cannot check the condition \( S\text{.age} < 18 \), which involves one of those fields.

We can also combine information in the Students and Enrolled relations. If we want to obtain the names of all students who obtained an A and the id of the course in which they got an A, we could write the following query:

\[
\text{SELECT } S\text{.name, } E\text{.cid} \\
\text{FROM Students } S, \text{ Enrolled } E \\
\text{WHERE } S\text{.sid} = E\text{.sid AND } E\text{.grade} = 'A'
\]
DISTINCT types in SQL: A comparison of two values drawn from different domains should fail, even if the values are ‘compatible’ in the sense that both are numeric or both are string values etc. For example, if salary and age are two different domains whose values are represented as integers, a comparison of a salary value with an age value should fail. Unfortunately, SQL-92’s support for the concept of domains does not go this far: We are forced to define salary and age as integer types and the comparison $S < A$ will succeed when $S$ is bound to the salary value 25 and $A$ is bound to the age value 50. The latest version of the SQL standard, called SQL:1999, addresses this problem, and allows us to define salary and age as DISTINCT types even though their values are represented as integers. Many systems, e.g., Informix UDS and IBM DB2, already support this feature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madayan</td>
<td>madayan@music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guldu</td>
<td>guldu@music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.7 Names and Logins of Students under 18

This query can be understood as follows: “If there is a Students tuple $S$ and an Enrolled tuple $E$ such that $S.sid = E.sid$ (so that $S$ describes the student who is enrolled in $E$) and $E.grade = ‘A’, then print the student’s name and the course id.” When evaluated on the instances of Students and Enrolled in Figure 3.4, this query returns a single tuple, $⟨Smith, Topology112⟩$.

We will cover relational queries, and SQL in particular, in more detail in subsequent chapters.

3.5 LOGICAL DATABASE DESIGN: ER TO RELATIONAL

The ER model is convenient for representing an initial, high-level database design. Given an ER diagram describing a database, there is a standard approach to generating a relational database schema that closely approximates the ER design. (The translation is approximate to the extent that we cannot capture all the constraints implicit in the ER design using SQL-92, unless we use certain SQL-92 constraints that are costly to check.) We now describe how to translate an ER diagram into a collection of tables with associated constraints, i.e., a relational database schema.
3.5.1 Entity Sets to Tables

An entity set is mapped to a relation in a straightforward way: Each attribute of the entity set becomes an attribute of the table. Note that we know both the domain of each attribute and the (primary) key of an entity set.

Consider the Employees entity set with attributes ssn, name, and lot shown in Figure 3.8. A possible instance of the Employees entity set, containing three Employees entities, is shown in Figure 3.9 in a tabular format.

![Figure 3.8 The Employees Entity Set](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ssn</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123-22-3666</td>
<td>Attishoo</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231-31-5368</td>
<td>Smiley</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131-24-3650</td>
<td>Smethurst</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 3.9 An Instance of the Employees Entity Set](image)

The following SQL statement captures the preceding information, including the domain constraints and key information:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Employees ( ssn CHAR(11),
                          name CHAR(30),
                          lot INTEGER,
                          PRIMARY KEY (ssn) )
```

3.5.2 Relationship Sets (without Constraints) to Tables

A relationship set, like an entity set, is mapped to a relation in the relational model. We begin by considering relationship sets without key and participation constraints, and we discuss how to handle such constraints in subsequent sections. To represent a relationship, we must be able to identify each participating entity and give values
to the descriptive attributes of the relationship. Thus, the attributes of the relation include:

- The primary key attributes of each participating entity set, as foreign key fields.
- The descriptive attributes of the relationship set.

The set of nondescriptive attributes is a superkey for the relation. If there are no key constraints (see Section 2.4.1), this set of attributes is a candidate key.

Consider the Works_In2 relationship set shown in Figure 3.10. Each department has offices in several locations and we want to record the locations at which each employee works.

![Figure 3.10 A Ternary Relationship Set](image)

All the available information about the Works_In2 table is captured by the following SQL definition:

```
CREATE TABLE Works_In2 ( ssn CHAR(11),
                          did INTEGER,
                          address CHAR(20),
                          since DATE,
                          PRIMARY KEY (ssn, did, address),
                          FOREIGN KEY (ssn) REFERENCES Employees,
                          FOREIGN KEY (address) REFERENCES Locations,
                          FOREIGN KEY (did) REFERENCES Departments )
```

Note that the address, did, and ssn fields cannot take on null values. Because these fields are part of the primary key for Works_In2, a NOT NULL constraint is implicit for each of these fields. This constraint ensures that these fields uniquely identify a department, an employee, and a location in each tuple of Works_In. We can also
specify that a particular action is desired when a referenced Employees, Departments or Locations tuple is deleted, as explained in the discussion of integrity constraints in Section 3.2. In this chapter we assume that the default action is appropriate except for situations in which the semantics of the ER diagram require some other action.

Finally, consider the Reports_To relationship set shown in Figure 3.11. The role indicators supervisor and subordinate are used to create meaningful field names in the CREATE statement for the Reports_To table:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Reports_To (
    supervisor_ssn  CHAR(11),
    subordinate_ssn  CHAR(11),
    PRIMARY KEY (supervisor_ssn, subordinate_ssn),
    FOREIGN KEY (supervisor_ssn) REFERENCES Employees(ssn),
    FOREIGN KEY (subordinate_ssn) REFERENCES Employees(ssn) )
```

Observe that we need to explicitly name the referenced field of Employees because the field name differs from the name(s) of the referring field(s).

### 3.5.3 Translating Relationship Sets with Key Constraints

If a relationship set involves *n* entity sets and some *m* of them are linked via arrows in the ER diagram, the key for any one of these *m* entity sets constitutes a key for the relation to which the relationship set is mapped. Thus we have *m* candidate keys, and one of these should be designated as the primary key. The translation discussed in Section 2.3 from relationship sets to a relation can be used in the presence of key constraints, taking into account this point about keys.
Consider the relationship set Manages shown in Figure 3.12. The table corresponding to Manages has the attributes \( ssn, \ did, \ since \). However, because each department has at most one manager, no two tuples can have the same \( did \) value but differ on the \( ssn \) value. A consequence of this observation is that \( did \) is itself a key for Manages; indeed, the set \( did, ssn \) is not a key (because it is not minimal). The Manages relation can be defined using the following SQL statement:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Manages ( ssn CHAR(11),
did INTEGER,
since DATE,
PRIMARY KEY (did),
FOREIGN KEY (ssn) REFERENCES Employees,
FOREIGN KEY (did) REFERENCES Departments )
```

A second approach to translating a relationship set with key constraints is often superior because it avoids creating a distinct table for the relationship set. The idea is to include the information about the relationship set in the table corresponding to the entity set with the key, taking advantage of the key constraint. In the Manages example, because a department has at most one manager, we can add the key fields of the Employees tuple denoting the manager and the \( since \) attribute to the Departments tuple.

This approach eliminates the need for a separate Manages relation, and queries asking for a department’s manager can be answered without combining information from two relations. The only drawback to this approach is that space could be wasted if several departments have no managers. In this case the added fields would have to be filled with \textit{null} values. The first translation (using a separate table for Manages) avoids this inefficiency, but some important queries require us to combine information from two relations, which can be a slow operation.

The following SQL statement, defining a Dept_Mgr relation that captures the information in both Departments and Manages, illustrates the second approach to translating relationship sets with key constraints:

![Figure 3.12 Key Constraint on Manages](image-url)
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CREATE TABLE Dept_Mgr ( did INTEGER,
    dname CHAR(20),
    budget REAL,
    ssn CHAR(11),
    since DATE,
    PRIMARY KEY (did),
    FOREIGN KEY (ssn) REFERENCES Employees )

Note that ssn can take on null values.

This idea can be extended to deal with relationship sets involving more than two entity sets. In general, if a relationship set involves n entity sets and some m of them are linked via arrows in the ER diagram, the relation corresponding to any one of the m sets can be augmented to capture the relationship.

We discuss the relative merits of the two translation approaches further after considering how to translate relationship sets with participation constraints into tables.

3.5.4 Translating Relationship Sets with Participation Constraints

Consider the ER diagram in Figure 3.13, which shows two relationship sets, Manages and Works_In.

Figure 3.13  Manages and Works_In
Every department is required to have a manager, due to the participation constraint, and at most one manager, due to the key constraint. The following SQL statement reflects the second translation approach discussed in Section 3.5.3, and uses the key constraint:

```
CREATE TABLE Dept_Mgr ( did INTEGER,
                        dname CHAR(20),
                        budget REAL,
                        ssn CHAR(11) NOT NULL,
                        since DATE,
                        PRIMARY KEY (did),
                        FOREIGN KEY (ssn) REFERENCES Employees
                        ON DELETE NO ACTION )
```

It also captures the participation constraint that every department must have a manager: Because ssn cannot take on null values, each tuple of Dept_Mgr identifies a tuple in Employees (who is the manager). The NO ACTION specification, which is the default and need not be explicitly specified, ensures that an Employees tuple cannot be deleted while it is pointed to by a Dept_Mgr tuple. If we wish to delete such an Employees tuple, we must first change the Dept_Mgr tuple to have a new employee as manager. (We could have specified CASCADE instead of NO ACTION, but deleting all information about a department just because its manager has been fired seems a bit extreme!)

The constraint that every department must have a manager cannot be captured using the first translation approach discussed in Section 3.5.3. (Look at the definition of Manages and think about what effect it would have if we added NOT NULL constraints to the ssn and did fields. Hint: The constraint would prevent the firing of a manager, but does not ensure that a manager is initially appointed for each department!) This situation is a strong argument in favor of using the second approach for one-to-many relationships such as Manages, especially when the entity set with the key constraint also has a total participation constraint.

Unfortunately, there are many participation constraints that we cannot capture using SQL-92, short of using table constraints or assertions. Table constraints and assertions can be specified using the full power of the SQL query language (as discussed in Section 5.11) and are very expressive, but also very expensive to check and enforce. For example, we cannot enforce the participation constraints on the Works_In relation without using these general constraints. To see why, consider the Works_In relation obtained by translating the ER diagram into relations. It contains fields ssn and did, which are foreign keys referring to Employees and Departments. To ensure total participation of Departments in Works_In, we have to guarantee that every did value in Departments appears in a tuple of Works_In. We could try to guarantee this condition by declaring that did in Departments is a foreign key referring to Works_In, but this is not a valid foreign key constraint because did is not a candidate key for Works_In.
To ensure total participation of Departments in Works_In using SQL-92, we need an assertion. We have to guarantee that every did value in Departments appears in a tuple of Works_In; further, this tuple of Works_In must also have non null values in the fields that are foreign keys referencing other entity sets involved in the relationship (in this example, the ssn field). We can ensure the second part of this constraint by imposing the stronger requirement that ssn in Works_In cannot contain null values. (Ensuring that the participation of Employees in Works_In is total is symmetric.)

Another constraint that requires assertions to express in SQL is the requirement that each Employees entity (in the context of the Manages relationship set) must manage at least one department.

In fact, the Manages relationship set exemplifies most of the participation constraints that we can capture using key and foreign key constraints. Manages is a binary relationship set in which exactly one of the entity sets (Departments) has a key constraint, and the total participation constraint is expressed on that entity set.

We can also capture participation constraints using key and foreign key constraints in one other special situation: a relationship set in which all participating entity sets have key constraints and total participation. The best translation approach in this case is to map all the entities as well as the relationship into a single table; the details are straightforward.

### 3.5.5 Translating Weak Entity Sets

A weak entity set always participates in a one-to-many binary relationship and has a key constraint and total participation. The second translation approach discussed in Section 3.5.3 is ideal in this case, but we must take into account the fact that the weak entity has only a partial key. Also, when an owner entity is deleted, we want all owned weak entities to be deleted.

Consider the Dependents weak entity set shown in Figure 3.14, with partial key pname. A Dependents entity can be identified uniquely only if we take the key of the owning Employees entity and the pname of the Dependents entity, and the Dependents entity must be deleted if the owning Employees entity is deleted.

We can capture the desired semantics with the following definition of the Dep_Policy relation:

```sql
CREATE TABLE Dep_Policy (
    pname CHAR(20),
    age INTEGER,
    cost REAL,
    ssn CHAR(11),
);```
Observe that the primary key is \( (pname, ssn) \), since Dependents is a weak entity. This constraint is a change with respect to the translation discussed in Section 3.5.3. We have to ensure that every Dependents entity is associated with an Employees entity (the owner), as per the total participation constraint on Dependents. That is, \( ssn \) cannot be null. This is ensured because \( ssn \) is part of the primary key. The CASCADE option ensures that information about an employee’s policy and dependents is deleted if the corresponding Employees tuple is deleted.

### 3.5.6 Translating Class Hierarchies

We present the two basic approaches to handling ISA hierarchies by applying them to the ER diagram shown in Figure 3.15:
1. We can map each of the entity sets Employees, Hourly_Emps, and Contract_Emps to a distinct relation. The Employees relation is created as in Section 2.2. We discuss Hourly_Emps here; Contract_Emps is handled similarly. The relation for Hourly_Emps includes the hourly_wages and hours_worked attributes of Hourly_Emps. It also contains the key attributes of the superclass (ssn, in this example), which serve as the primary key for Hourly_Emps, as well as a foreign key referencing the superclass (Employees). For each Hourly_Emps entity, the value of the name and lot attributes are stored in the corresponding row of the superclass (Employees). Note that if the superclass tuple is deleted, the delete must be cascaded to Hourly_Emps.

2. Alternatively, we can create just two relations, corresponding to Hourly_Emps and Contract_Emps. The relation for Hourly_Emps includes all the attributes of Hourly_Emps as well as all the attributes of Employees (i.e., ssn, name, lot, hourly_wages, hours_worked).

The first approach is general and is always applicable. Queries in which we want to examine all employees and do not care about the attributes specific to the subclasses are handled easily using the Employees relation. However, queries in which we want to examine, say, hourly employees, may require us to combine Hourly_Emps (or Contract_Emps, as the case may be) with Employees to retrieve name and lot.

The second approach is not applicable if we have employees who are neither hourly employees nor contract employees, since there is no way to store such employees. Also, if an employee is both an Hourly_Emps and a Contract_Emps entity, then the name and lot values are stored twice. This duplication can lead to some of the anomalies that we discuss in Chapter 15. A query that needs to examine all employees must now examine two relations. On the other hand, a query that needs to examine only hourly employees can now do so by examining just one relation. The choice between these approaches clearly depends on the semantics of the data and the frequency of common operations.

In general, overlap and covering constraints can be expressed in SQL-92 only by using assertions.

### 3.5.7 Translating ER Diagrams with Aggregation

Translating aggregation into the relational model is easy because there is no real distinction between entities and relationships in the relational model.

Consider the ER diagram shown in Figure 3.16. The Employees, Projects, and Departments entity sets and the Sponsors relationship set are mapped as described in previous sections. For the Monitors relationship set, we create a relation with the following attributes: the key attributes of Employees (ssn), the key attributes of Spon-
sors \((\text{did}, \text{pid})\), and the descriptive attributes of Monitors \((\text{until})\). This translation is essentially the standard mapping for a relationship set, as described in Section 3.5.2.

There is a special case in which this translation can be refined further by dropping the Sponsors relation. Consider the Sponsors relation. It has attributes \(\text{pid}, \text{did}, \text{since}\), and in general we need it (in addition to Monitors) for two reasons:

1. We have to record the descriptive attributes (in our example, \(\text{since}\)) of the Sponsors relationship.

2. Not every sponsorship has a monitor, and thus some \(\langle \text{pid}, \text{did} \rangle\) pairs in the Sponsors relation may not appear in the Monitors relation.

However, if Sponsors has no descriptive attributes and has total participation in Monitors, every possible instance of the Sponsors relation can be obtained by looking at the \(\langle \text{pid}, \text{did} \rangle\) columns of the Monitors relation. Thus, we need not store the Sponsors relation in this case.

### 3.5.8 ER to Relational: Additional Examples *

Consider the ER diagram shown in Figure 3.17. We can translate this ER diagram into the relational model as follows, taking advantage of the key constraints to combine Purchaser information with Policies and Beneficiary information with Dependents:
Notice how the deletion of an employee leads to the deletion of all policies owned by the employee and all dependents who are beneficiaries of those policies. Further, each dependent is required to have a covering policy—because \textit{policyid} is part of the primary key of Dependents, there is an implicit \texttt{NOT NULL} constraint. This model accurately reflects the participation constraints in the ER diagram and the intended actions when an employee entity is deleted.

In general, there could be a chain of identifying relationships for weak entity sets. For example, we assumed that \textit{policyid} uniquely identifies a policy. Suppose that \textit{policyid} only distinguishes the policies owned by a given employee; that is, \textit{policyid} is only a partial key and Policies should be modeled as a weak entity set. This new assumption
about \textit{policyid} does not cause much to change in the preceding discussion. In fact, the only changes are that the primary key of Policies becomes \((\text{policyid, ssn})\), and as a consequence, the definition of Dependents changes—a field called \textit{ssn} is added and becomes part of both the primary key of Dependents and the foreign key referencing Policies:

\begin{verbatim}
CREATE TABLE Dependents (  pname CHAR(20),
  ssn CHAR(11),
  age INTEGER,
  policyid INTEGER NOT NULL,
  PRIMARY KEY (pname, policyid, ssn),
  FOREIGN KEY (policyid, ssn) REFERENCES Policies
    ON DELETE CASCADE)
\end{verbatim}

3.6 \textbf{INTRODUCTION TO VIEWS}

A \textit{view} is a table whose rows are not explicitly stored in the database but are computed as needed from a \textit{view definition}. Consider the Students and Enrolled relations. Suppose that we are often interested in finding the names and student identifiers of students who got a grade of B in some course, together with the \textit{cid} for the course. We can define a view for this purpose. Using SQL-92 notation:

\begin{verbatim}
CREATE VIEW B-Students (name, sid, course)
AS SELECT S.sname, S.sid, E.cid
  FROM Students S, Enrolled E
  WHERE S.sid = E.sid AND E.grade = 'B'
\end{verbatim}

The view B-Students has three fields called \textit{name}, \textit{sid}, and \textit{course} with the same domains as the fields \textit{sname} and \textit{sid} in Students and \textit{cid} in Enrolled. (If the optional arguments \textit{name}, \textit{sid}, and \textit{course} are omitted from the \texttt{CREATE VIEW} statement, the column names \textit{sname}, \textit{sid}, and \textit{cid} are inherited.)

This view can be used just like a \textbf{base table}, or explicitly stored table, in defining new queries or views. Given the instances of Enrolled and Students shown in Figure 3.4, B-Students contains the tuples shown in Figure 3.18. Conceptually, whenever B-Students is used in a query, the view definition is first evaluated to obtain the corresponding instance of B-Students, and then the rest of the query is evaluated treating B-Students like any other relation referred to in the query. (We will discuss how queries on views are evaluated in practice in Chapter 23.)
3.6.1 Views, Data Independence, Security

Consider the levels of abstraction that we discussed in Section 1.5.2. The physical schema for a relational database describes how the relations in the conceptual schema are stored, in terms of the file organizations and indexes used. The conceptual schema is the collection of schemas of the relations stored in the database. While some relations in the conceptual schema can also be exposed to applications, i.e., be part of the external schema of the database, additional relations in the external schema can be defined using the view mechanism. The view mechanism thus provides the support for logical data independence in the relational model. That is, it can be used to define relations in the external schema that mask changes in the conceptual schema of the database from applications. For example, if the schema of a stored relation is changed, we can define a view with the old schema, and applications that expect to see the old schema can now use this view.

Views are also valuable in the context of security. We can define views that give a group of users access to just the information they are allowed to see. For example, we can define a view that allows students to see other students’ name and age but not their gpa, and allow all students to access this view, but not the underlying Students table (see Chapter 17).

3.6.2 Updates on Views

The motivation behind the view mechanism is to tailor how users see the data. Users should not have to worry about the view versus base table distinction. This goal is indeed achieved in the case of queries on views; a view can be used just like any other relation in defining a query. However, it is natural to want to specify updates on views as well. Here, unfortunately, the distinction between a view and a base table must be kept in mind.

The SQL-92 standard allows updates to be specified only on views that are defined on a single base table using just selection and projection, with no use of aggregate operations. Such views are called updatable views. This definition is oversimplified, but it captures the spirit of the restrictions. An update on such a restricted view can
always be implemented by updating the underlying base table in an unambiguous way. Consider the following view:

```
CREATE VIEW GoodStudents (sid, gpa)
AS SELECT S.sid, S.gpa
FROM Students S
WHERE S.gpa > 3.0
```

We can implement a command to modify the gpa of a GoodStudents row by modifying the corresponding row in Students. We can delete a GoodStudents row by deleting the corresponding row from Students. (In general, if the view did not include a key for the underlying table, several rows in the table could ‘correspond’ to a single row in the view. This would be the case, for example, if we used $S.sname$ instead of $S.sid$ in the definition of GoodStudents. A command that affects a row in the view would then affect all corresponding rows in the underlying table.)

We can insert a GoodStudents row by inserting a row into Students, using null values in columns of Students that do not appear in GoodStudents (e.g., $sname$, $login$). Note that primary key columns are not allowed to contain null values. Therefore, if we attempt to insert rows through a view that does not contain the primary key of the underlying table, the insertions will be rejected. For example, if GoodStudents contained $sname$ but not $sid$, we could not insert rows into Students through insertions to GoodStudents.

An important observation is that an INSERT or UPDATE may change the underlying base table so that the resulting (i.e., inserted or modified) row is not in the view! For example, if we try to insert a row ($51234$, $2.8$) into the view, this row can be (padded with null values in the other fields of Students and then) added to the underlying Students table, but it will not appear in the GoodStudents view because it does not satisfy the view condition $gpa > 3.0$. The SQL-92 default action is to allow this insertion, but we can disallow it by adding the clause WITH CHECK OPTION to the definition of the view.

We caution the reader that when a view is defined in terms of another view, the interaction between these view definitions with respect to updates and the CHECK OPTION clause can be complex; we will not go into the details.

**Need to Restrict View Updates**

While the SQL-92 rules on updatable views are more stringent than necessary, there are some fundamental problems with updates specified on views, and there is good reason to limit the class of views that can be updated. Consider the Students relation and a new relation called Clubs:
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Clubs(cname: string, jyear: date, mname: string)

A tuple in Clubs denotes that the student called mname has been a member of the club cname since the date jyear. Suppose that we are often interested in finding the names and logins of students with a gpa greater than 3 who belong to at least one club, along with the club name and the date they joined the club. We can define a view for this purpose:

\[
\text{CREATE VIEW ActiveStudents (name, login, club, since) AS SELECT S.sname, S.login, C.cname, C.jyear FROM Students S, Clubs C WHERE S.sname = C.mname AND S.gpa > 3}
\]

Consider the instances of Students and Clubs shown in Figures 3.19 and 3.20. When evaluated using the instances C and S3, ActiveStudents contains the rows shown in Figure 3.21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>cname</th>
<th>jyear</th>
<th>mname</th>
<th>sid</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>gpa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>50000</td>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>dave@cs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>53666</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>jones@cs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>53688</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53650</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.19 An Instance C of Clubs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>login</th>
<th>club</th>
<th>since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave</td>
<td>dave@cs</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@ee</td>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>smith@math</td>
<td>Rowing</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.20 An Instance S3 of Students

Figure 3.21 Instance of ActiveStudents

Now suppose that we want to delete the row ⟨Smith, smith@ee, Hiking, 1997⟩ from ActiveStudents. How are we to do this? ActiveStudents rows are not stored explicitly but are computed as needed from the Students and Clubs tables using the view definition. So we must change either Students or Clubs (or both) in such a way that evaluating the

\[^{4}\text{We remark that Clubs has a poorly designed schema (chosen for the sake of our discussion of view updates), since it identifies students by name, which is not a candidate key for Students.}\]
view definition on the modified instance does not produce the row \((Smith, smith@ee, Hiking, 1997)\). This task can be accomplished in one of two ways: by either deleting the row \((53688, Smith, smith@ee, 18, 3.2)\) from Students or deleting the row \((Hiking, 1997, Smith)\) from Clubs. But neither solution is satisfactory. Removing the Students row has the effect of also deleting the row \((Smith, smith@ee, Rowing, 1998)\) from the view ActiveStudents. Removing the Clubs row has the effect of also deleting the row \((Smith, smith@math, Hiking, 1997)\) from the view ActiveStudents. Neither of these side effects is desirable. In fact, the only reasonable solution is to disallow such updates on views.

There are views involving more than one base table that can, in principle, be safely updated. The B-Students view that we introduced at the beginning of this section is an example of such a view. Consider the instance of B-Students shown in Figure 3.18 (with, of course, the corresponding instances of Students and Enrolled as in Figure 3.4). To insert a tuple, say \((Dave, 50000, Reggae203)\) B-Students, we can simply insert a tuple \((Reggae203, B, 50000)\) into Enrolled since there is already a tuple for sid 50000 in Students. To insert \((John, 55000, Reggae203)\), on the other hand, we have to insert \((Reggae203, B, 55000)\) into Enrolled and also insert \((55000, John, null, null, null)\) into Students. Observe how null values are used in fields of the inserted tuple whose value is not available. Fortunately, the view schema contains the primary key fields of both underlying base tables; otherwise, we would not be able to support insertions into this view. To delete a tuple from the view B-Students, we can simply delete the corresponding tuple from Enrolled.

Although this example illustrates that the SQL-92 rules on updatable views are unnecessarily restrictive, it also brings out the complexity of handling view updates in the general case. For practical reasons, the SQL-92 standard has chosen to allow only updates on a very restricted class of views.

### 3.7 DESTROYING/ALTERING TABLES AND VIEWS

If we decide that we no longer need a base table and want to destroy it (i.e., delete all the rows and remove the table definition information), we can use the `DROP TABLE` command. For example, `DROP TABLE Students RESTRICT` destroys the Students table unless some view or integrity constraint refers to Students; if so, the command fails. If the keyword `RESTRICT` is replaced by `CASCADE`, Students is dropped and any referencing views or integrity constraints are (recursively) dropped as well; one of these two keywords must always be specified. A view can be dropped using the `DROP VIEW` command, which is just like `DROP TABLE`.

`ALTER TABLE` modifies the structure of an existing table. To add a column called `maiden-name` to Students, for example, we would use the following command:
The definition of Students is modified to add this column, and all existing rows are padded with `null` values in this column. `ALTER TABLE` can also be used to delete columns and to add or drop integrity constraints on a table; we will not discuss these aspects of the command beyond remarking that dropping columns is treated very similarly to dropping tables or views.

### 3.8 Points to review

- The main element of the relational model is a relation. A relation schema describes the structure of a relation by specifying the relation name and the names of each field. In addition, the relation schema includes domain constraints, which are type restrictions on the fields of the relation. The number of fields is called the degree of the relation. The relation instance is an actual table that contains a set of tuples that adhere to the relation schema. The number of tuples is called the cardinality of the relation. SQL-92 is a standard language for interacting with a DBMS. Its data definition language (DDL) enables the creation (CREATE TABLE) and modification (DELETE, UPDATE) of relations. (Section 3.1)

- Integrity constraints are conditions on a database schema that every legal database instance has to satisfy. Besides domain constraints, other important types of ICs are key constraints (a minimal set of fields that uniquely identify a tuple) and foreign key constraints (fields in one relation that refer to fields in another relation). SQL-92 supports the specification of the above kinds of ICs, as well as more general constraints called table constraints and assertions. (Section 3.2)

- ICs are enforced whenever a relation is modified and the specified ICs might conflict with the modification. For foreign key constraint violations, SQL-92 provides several alternatives to deal with the violation: NO ACTION, CASCADE, SET DEFAULT, and SET NULL. (Section 3.3)

- A relational database query is a question about the data. SQL supports a very expressive query language. (Section 3.4)

- There are standard translations of ER model constructs into SQL. Entity sets are mapped into relations. Relationship sets without constraints are also mapped into relations. When translating relationship sets with constraints, weak entity sets, class hierarchies, and aggregation, the mapping is more complicated. (Section 3.5)

- A view is a relation whose instance is not explicitly stored but is computed as needed. In addition to enabling logical data independence by defining the external schema through views, views play an important role in restricting access to data for
security reasons. Since views might be defined through complex queries, handling updates specified on views is complicated, and SQL-92 has very stringent rules on when a view is updatable. (Section 3.6)

- SQL provides language constructs to modify the structure of tables (\texttt{ALTER TABLE}) and to destroy tables and views (\texttt{DROP TABLE}). (Section 3.7)

EXERCISES

Exercise 3.1 Define the following terms: \textit{relation schema}, \textit{relational database schema}, \textit{domain}, \textit{relation instance}, \textit{relation cardinality}, and \textit{relation degree}.

Exercise 3.2 How many distinct tuples are in a relation instance with cardinality 22?

Exercise 3.3 Does the relational model, as seen by an SQL query writer, provide physical and logical data independence? Explain.

Exercise 3.4 What is the difference between a candidate key and the primary key for a given relation? What is a superkey?

Exercise 3.5 Consider the instance of the Students relation shown in Figure 3.1.

1. Give an example of an attribute (or set of attributes) that you can deduce is not a candidate key, based on this instance being legal.

2. Is there any example of an attribute (or set of attributes) that you can deduce is a candidate key, based on this instance being legal?

Exercise 3.6 What is a foreign key constraint? Why are such constraints important? What is referential integrity?

Exercise 3.7 Consider the relations Students, Faculty, Courses, Rooms, Enrolled, Teaches, and Meets that were defined in Section 1.5.2.

1. List all the foreign key constraints among these relations.

2. Give an example of a (plausible) constraint involving one or more of these relations that is not a primary key or foreign key constraint.

Exercise 3.8 Answer each of the following questions briefly. The questions are based on the following relational schema:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Emp}(\text{eid}: \text{integer}, \text{ename}: \text{string}, \text{age}: \text{integer}, \text{salary}: \text{real})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Works}(\text{eid}: \text{integer}, \text{did}: \text{integer}, \text{pct\_time}: \text{integer})
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dept}(\text{did}: \text{integer}, \text{dname}: \text{string}, \text{budget}: \text{real}, \text{managerid}: \text{integer})
\end{align*}
\]

1. Give an example of a foreign key constraint that involves the Dept relation. What are the options for enforcing this constraint when a user attempts to delete a Dept tuple?
2. Write the SQL statements required to create the above relations, including appropriate versions of all primary and foreign key integrity constraints.

3. Define the Dept relation in SQL so that every department is guaranteed to have a manager.

4. Write an SQL statement to add ‘John Doe’ as an employee with $eid = 101, age = 32$ and $salary = 15,000$.

5. Write an SQL statement to give every employee a 10% raise.

6. Write an SQL statement to delete the ‘Toy’ department. Given the referential integrity constraints you chose for this schema, explain what happens when this statement is executed.

**Exercise 3.9** Consider the SQL query whose answer is shown in Figure 3.6.

1. Modify this query so that only the $login$ column is included in the answer.

2. If the clause $\text{WHERE } S.gpa >= 2$ is added to the original query, what is the set of tuples in the answer?

**Exercise 3.10** Explain why the addition of $\text{NOT NULL}$ constraints to the SQL definition of the Manages relation (in Section 3.5.3) would not enforce the constraint that each department must have a manager. What, if anything, is achieved by requiring that the $ssn$ field of Manages be non-null?

**Exercise 3.11** Suppose that we have a ternary relationship R between entity sets A, B, and C such that A has a key constraint and total participation and B has a key constraint; these are the only constraints. A has attributes $a_1$ and $a_2$, with $a_1$ being the key; B and C are similar. R has no descriptive attributes. Write SQL statements that create tables corresponding to this information so as to capture as many of the constraints as possible. If you cannot capture some constraint, explain why.

**Exercise 3.12** Consider the scenario from Exercise 2.2 where you designed an ER diagram for a university database. Write SQL statements to create the corresponding relations and capture as many of the constraints as possible. If you cannot capture some constraints, explain why.

**Exercise 3.13** Consider the university database from Exercise 2.3 and the ER diagram that you designed. Write SQL statements to create the corresponding relations and capture as many of the constraints as possible. If you cannot capture some constraints, explain why.

**Exercise 3.14** Consider the scenario from Exercise 2.4 where you designed an ER diagram for a company database. Write SQL statements to create the corresponding relations and capture as many of the constraints as possible. If you cannot capture some constraints, explain why.

**Exercise 3.15** Consider the Notown database from Exercise 2.5. You have decided to recommend that Notown use a relational database system to store company data. Show the SQL statements for creating relations corresponding to the entity sets and relationship sets in your design. Identify any constraints in the ER diagram that you are unable to capture in the SQL statements and briefly explain why you could not express them.
**Exercise 3.16** Translate your ER diagram from Exercise 2.6 into a relational schema, and show the SQL statements needed to create the relations, using only key and null constraints. If your translation cannot capture any constraints in the ER diagram, explain why.

In Exercise 2.6, you also modified the ER diagram to include the constraint that tests on a plane must be conducted by a technician who is an expert on that model. Can you modify the SQL statements defining the relations obtained by mapping the ER diagram to check this constraint?

**Exercise 3.17** Consider the ER diagram that you designed for the Prescriptions-R-X chain of pharmacies in Exercise 2.7. Define relations corresponding to the entity sets and relationship sets in your design using SQL.

**Exercise 3.18** Write SQL statements to create the corresponding relations to the ER diagram you designed for Exercise 2.8. If your translation cannot capture any constraints in the ER diagram, explain why.

### PROJECT-BASED EXERCISES

**Exercise 3.19** Create the relations Students, Faculty, Courses, Rooms, Enrolled, Teaches, and Meets In in Minibase.

**Exercise 3.20** Insert the tuples shown in Figures 3.1 and 3.4 into the relations Students and Enrolled. Create reasonable instances of the other relations.

**Exercise 3.21** What integrity constraints are enforced by Minibase?

**Exercise 3.22** Run the SQL queries presented in this chapter.
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