Foundations of Databases

Datalog

Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, 2009

Werner Nutt

(Based on slides by Thomas Eiter and Wolfgang Faber)

Motivation

- Relational Calculus and Relational Algebra were considered to be "*the*" database languages for a long time
- Codd: A query language is "complete," if it yields Relational Calculus
- However, Relational Calculus misses an important feature: *recursion*
- Example: A metro database with relation `links:line, station, nextstation`

  What stations are reachable from station "Odeon"?

  Can we go from Odeon to Tuileries?

  etc.
- It can be proved: such queries cannot be expressed in Relational Calculus
- This motivated a logic-programming extension to conjunctive queries: *datalog*

Example: Metro Database Instance

links	line	station	nextstation
	4	St.Germain	Odeon
	4	Odeon	St.Michel
	4	St. Michel	Chatelet
	1	Chatelet	Louvres
	1	Louvres	Palais Royal
	1	Palais-Royal	Tuileries
	1	Tuileries	Concorde

Datalog program for first query:

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X},\texttt{X}) & \leftarrow & \texttt{links}(\texttt{L},\texttt{X},\texttt{Y}) \\
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X},\texttt{X}) & \leftarrow & \texttt{links}(\texttt{L},\texttt{Y},\texttt{X}) \\
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X},\texttt{Y}) & \leftarrow & \texttt{links}(\texttt{L},\texttt{X},\texttt{Z}), \texttt{reach}(\texttt{Z},\texttt{Y}) \\
\texttt{answer}(\texttt{X}) & \leftarrow & \texttt{reach}(\text{`}\texttt{Odeon}\text{`},\texttt{X})
\end{array}
$$

Note: recursive definition

Intuitively, if the part right of “$\leftarrow$” is true, the rule “fires” and the atom left of “$\leftarrow$” is concluded.

The Datalog Language

- datalog is akin to Logic Programming
- The basic language (considered next) has many extensions
- There exist several approaches to defining the semantics:

Model-theoretic approach:

View rules as logical sentences, which state the query result

Operational (fixpoint) approach:

Obtain query result by applying an inference procedure, until a fixpoint is reached

Proof-theoretic approach:

Obtain proofs of facts in the query result, following a proof calculus (based on resolution)

Datalog vs. Logic Programming

Although Datalog is akin to Logic Programming, there are important differences:

- There are **no functions symbols** in datalog. Consequently, no potentially infinite data structures, such as lists, are supported
- Datalog has a **purely declarative semantics.** In a datalog program,
  - the *order of clauses* is irrelevant
  - the *order of atoms* in a rule body is irrelevant
- Datalog programs adhere to the **active domain semantics** (like Safe Relational Calculus, Relational Algebra)
- Datalog distinguishes between
  - database relations ("*extensional database*", *edb*) and
  - derived relations ("*intensional database*", *idb*)

Syntax of "plain datalog", or "datalog"

Definition. A *datalog rule* r is an expression of the form

$$R_0(\vec{x}_0) \leftarrow R_1(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, R_n(\vec{x}_n) \qquad (1)$$

- where $n \geq 0$,
  $R_0, \ldots, R_n$ are relations names, and
  $\vec{x}_0, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ are vectors of variables and constants (from $\mathbf{dom}$)
- every variable in $\vec{x}_0$ occurs in $\vec{x}_1, \ldots, \vec{x}_n$ ("safety")

Remarks.

- The *head* of r, denoted $H(r)$, is $R_0(\vec{x}_0)$
- The *body* of r, denoted $B(r)$, is $\{ R_1(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, R_n(\vec{x}_n) \}$
- The rule symbol "$\longleftarrow$" is often also written as "`:-`"

Definition. A *datalog program* is a finite set of datalog rules.

Datalog Programs

Let P be a datalog program.

- An *extensional relation* of P is a relation occurring only in rule bodies of P
- An *intensional relation* of P is a relation occurring in the head of some rule in P
- The *extensional schema* of P, *edb*(P), consists of all extensional relations of P
- The *intensional schema* of P, *idb*(P), consists of all intensional relations of P
- The *schema* of P, *sch*(P), is the union of *edb*(P) and *idb*(P).

Remarks.

- Sometimes, extensional and intensional relations are explicitly specified. It is possible then for intensional relations to occur only in rule bodies (but such relations are of no use then).
- In a Logic Programming view, the term “predicate” is used as synonym for “relation” or “relation name.”

The Metro Example /1

Datalog program P on metro database scheme
$\mathcal{M} = \{\texttt{links} : \texttt{line}, \texttt{station}, \texttt{nextstation}\}$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{X}) &\leftarrow \texttt{links}(\texttt{L}, \texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \\
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{X}) &\leftarrow \texttt{links}(\texttt{L}, \texttt{Y}, \texttt{X}) \\
\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) &\leftarrow \texttt{links}(\texttt{L}, \texttt{X}, \texttt{Z}), \texttt{reach}(\texttt{Z}, \texttt{Y}) \\
\texttt{answer}(\texttt{X}) &\leftarrow \texttt{reach}('\texttt{Odeon}', \texttt{X})
\end{aligned}
$$

Here,

$$
\begin{aligned}
edb(P) &= \{\texttt{links}\} \quad (= \mathcal{M}), \\
idb(P) &= \{\texttt{reach}, \texttt{answer}\}, \\
sch(P) &= \{\texttt{links}, \texttt{reach}, \texttt{answer}\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Datalog Syntax (cntd)

- The set of constants occurring in a datalog program P is denoted as $adom(P)$
- Given a database instance $\mathbf{I}$, we define the *active domain* of P with respect to I as

$$adom(P, \mathbf{I}) := adom(P) \cup adom(\mathbf{I}),$$

that is, as the set of constants occurring in P and $\mathbf{I}$

Definition. Let $\nu\colon var(r) \cup \mathbf{dom} \rightarrow \mathbf{dom}$ be a valuation for a rule r of form (1). Then the *instantiation* of r with ν, denoted $\nu(r)$, is the rule

$$R_0(\nu(\vec{x}_0)) \leftarrow R_1(\nu(\vec{x}_1)), \ldots, R_n(\nu(\vec{x}_n))$$

which results from replacing each variable x with $\nu(x)$.

The Metro Example /2

- For the datalog program P above, we have that $adom(P)$ = $\{$ Odeon $\}$
- We consider the database instance $\mathbf{I}$:

links	line	station	nextstation
	4	St.Germain	Odeon
	4	Odeon	St.Michel
	4	St. Michel	Chatelet
	1	Chatelet	Louvres
	1	Louvres	Palais-Royal
	1	Palais-Royal	Tuileries
	1	Tuileries	Concorde

Then $adom(\mathbf{I}) = \{$4, 1, St.Germain, Odeon, St.Michel, Chatelet, Louvres, Palais-Royal, Tuileries, Concorde$\}$

- Also $adom(P, \mathbf{I}) = adom(\mathbf{I})$.

The Metro Example /3

- The rule

$$\texttt{reach}(\texttt{St.Germain}, \texttt{Odeon}) \quad \leftarrow \quad \texttt{links}(\texttt{Louvres}, \texttt{St.Germain}, \texttt{Concorde}),$$
$$\texttt{reach}(\texttt{Concorde}, \texttt{Odeon})$$

is an instance of the rule

$$\texttt{reach}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \quad \leftarrow \quad \texttt{links}(\texttt{L}, \texttt{X}, \texttt{Z}), \texttt{reach}(\texttt{Z}, \texttt{Y})$$

of P:

take $\nu(X)$ = St.Germain, $\nu(L)$ = Louvres, $\nu(Y)$ = Odeon, $\nu(Z)$ = Concorde

Datalog: Model-Theoretic Semantics

General Idea:

- We view a program as a set of first-order sentences
- Given an instance $\mathbf{I}$ of $edb(P)$, the result of P is a database instance of $sch(P)$ that extends $\mathbf{I}$ and satisfies the sentences (or, is a *model* of the sentences)
- There can be many models
- The *intended answer* is specified by particular models
- These particular models are selected by “external” conditions

Logical Theory Σ_P

- To every datalog rule r of the form $R_0(\vec{x}_0) \leftarrow R_1(\vec{x}_1), \ldots, R_n(\vec{x}_n)$, with variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, we associate the logical sentence $\sigma(r)$:

$$\forall x_1, \cdots \forall x_m \, (R_1(\vec{x}_1) \wedge \cdots \wedge R_n(\vec{x}_n) \rightarrow R_0(\vec{x}_0))$$

- To a program P, we associate the set of sentences $\Sigma_P = \{\sigma(r) \mid r \in P\}$.

Definition. Let P be a datalog program and $\mathbf{I}$ an instance of $edb(P)$. Then,

- A *model* of P is an instance of $sch(P)$ that satisfies Σ_P
- We compare models wrt set inclusion "$\subseteq$" (in the Logic Programming perspective)
- The *semantics* of P on input $\mathbf{I}$, denoted $P(\mathbf{I})$, is the *least model* of P containing $\mathbf{I}$, if it exists.

Example

For program P and instance $\mathbf{I}$ of the Metro Example, the least model is:

links	line	station	nextstation
	4	St.Germain	Odeon
	4	Odeon	St.Michel
	4	St. Michel	Chatelet
	1	Chatelet	Louvres
	1	Louvres	Palais-Royal
	1	Palais-Royal	Tuileries
	1	Tuileries	Concorde

reach		
	St.Germain	St.Germain
	Odeon	Odeon
	...	
	Concorde	Concorde
	St.Germain	Odeon
	St.Germain	St.Michel
	St.Germain	Chatelet
	St.Germain	Louvres
	...	

answer	
	Odeon
	St.Michel
	Chatelet
	Louvres
	Palais-Royal
	Tuileries
	Concorde

Questions

- Is the semantics $P(\mathbf{I})$ well-defined for every input instance $\mathbf{I}$?
- How can one compute $P(\mathbf{I})$?

Observation: For any $\mathbf{I}$, there is a model of P containing $\mathbf{I}$

- Let $\mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})$ be the instance of $sch(P)$ such that

$$\mathbf{B}(P,\mathbf{I})(R) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{I}(R) & \text{for each } R \in edb(P) \\ adom(P,\mathbf{I})^{arity(R)} & \text{for each } R \in idb(P) \end{cases}$$

- Then: $\mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})$ is a model of P containing $\mathbf{I}$

  $\Rightarrow$ $P(\mathbf{I})$ is a subset of $\mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})$ *(if it exists)*

- Naive algorithm: explore all subsets of $\mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})$

Elementary Properties of $P(\mathbf{I})$

Let P be a datalog program, $\mathbf{I}$ an instance of $edb(P)$, and $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{I})$ the set of all models of P containing $\mathbf{I}$.

Theorem. The intersection $\bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{I})} M$ is a model of P.

Corollary.

1. $P(\mathbf{I}) = \bigcap_{M \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{I})} M$
2. $adom(P(\mathbf{I})) \subseteq adom(P, \mathbf{I})$, that is, no new values appear
3. $P(\mathbf{I})(R) = \mathbf{I}(R)$, for each $R \in edb(P)$.

Consequences:

- $P(\mathbf{I})$ is well-defined for every $\mathbf{I}$
- If P and $\mathbf{I}$ are finite, the $P(\mathbf{I})$ is finite

Why Choose the Least Model?

There are two reasons to choose the least model containing $\mathbf{I}$:

1. The *Closed World Assumption*:
   - If a fact $R(\vec{c})$ is not true in all models of a database $\mathbf{I}$, then infer that $R(\vec{c})$ is false
   - This amounts to considering $\mathbf{I}$ as complete
   - ... which is customary in database practice
2. The relationship to Logic Programming:
   - Datalog should desirably match Logic Programming (seamless integration)
   - Logic Programming builds on the minimal model semantics

Relating Datalog to Logic Programming

- A logic program makes no distinction between edb and idb
- A datalog program P and an instance $\mathbf{I}$ of $edb(P)$ can be mapped to the logic program

$$\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I}) = P \cup \mathbf{I}$$

(where $\mathbf{I}$ is viewed as a set of atoms in the Logic Programming perspective)

- Correspondingly, we define the logical theory

$$\Sigma_{P,\mathbf{I}} = \Sigma_P \cup \mathbf{I}$$

- The semantics of the logic program $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$ is defined in terms of *Herbrand interpretations* of the language induced by $\mathcal{P}$:
  - The domain of discourse is formed by the constants occurring in $\mathcal{P}$
  - Each constant occurring in $\mathcal{P}$ is interpreted by itself

Herbrand Interpretations of Logic Programs

Given a rule r, we denote by *Const*(r) the set of all constants in r

Definition. For a (function-free) logic program $\mathcal{P}$, we define

- the *Herbrand universe* of $\mathcal{P}$, by

$$\mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \textit{Const}(r)$$

- the *Herbrand base* of $\mathcal{P}$, by

$$\mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P}) = \{R(c_1, \ldots, c_n) \mid R \text{ is a relation in } \mathcal{P}, \\ c_1, \ldots, c_n \in \mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P}), \text{ and } ar(R) = n\}$$

Example

$$\mathcal{P} = \{ \quad \texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}).$$

$$\texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}).$$

$$\texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}).$$

$$\texttt{reachable}(\texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \texttt{arc}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{X}). \}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P}) &= \{\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}, \texttt{c}\} \\
\mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P}) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{a}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{c}), \\
&\quad \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{a}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}), \\
&\quad \texttt{arc}(\texttt{c}, \texttt{a}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{c}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{c}, \texttt{c}), \\
&\quad \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{c})\}
\end{aligned}$$

Grounding

- A rule r' is a *ground instance* of a rule r with respect to $\mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P})$, if $r' = \nu(r)$ for a valuation ν such that $\nu(x) \in \mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P})$ for each $x \in var(r)$.
- The *grounding* of a rule r with respect to $\mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P})$, denoted $\mathit{Ground}_{\mathcal{P}}(r)$, is the set of all ground instances of r wrt $\mathbf{HU}(\mathcal{P})$
- The *grounding* of a logic program $\mathcal{P}$ is

$$\mathit{Ground}(\mathcal{P}) = \bigcup_{r \in \mathcal{P}} \mathit{Ground}_{\mathcal{P}}(r)$$

Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathit{Ground}(\mathcal{P}) = \{ & \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{a},\mathrm{b}).\ \ \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{b},\mathrm{c}).\ \ \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{a},\mathrm{a}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{a},\mathrm{b}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{a},\mathrm{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{b},\mathrm{a}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{b},\mathrm{b}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{b},\mathrm{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{a}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{c},\mathrm{a}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{b}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{c},\mathrm{b}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}). \\
& \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathrm{c},\mathrm{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathrm{c}).\ \}
\end{aligned}
$$

Herbrand Models

- A *Herbrand-interpretation* I of $\mathcal{P}$ is any subset $I \subseteq \mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P})$
- A *Herbrand-model* of $\mathcal{P}$ is a Herbrand-interpretation that satisfies all sentences in $\Sigma_{P,\mathbf{I}}$

Equivalently, $M \subseteq \mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P})$ is a Herbrand model if

- for all $r \in$ *Ground*$(\mathcal{P})$ such that $B(r) \subseteq M$ we have that $H(r) \subseteq M$

Example

The Herbrand models of program $\mathcal{P}$ above are exactly the following:

- $M_1 = \{ \ \mathtt{arc}(\mathtt{a},\mathtt{b}), \mathtt{arc}(\mathtt{b},\mathtt{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathtt{a}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathtt{b}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathtt{c}) \ \}$
- $M_2 = \mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P})$
- every interpretation M such that $M_1 \subseteq M \subseteq M_2$

and no others.

Logic Programming Semantics

- **Proposition.** $\mathbf{HB}(\mathcal{P})$ is always a model of $\mathcal{P}$
- **Theorem.** For every logic program there exists a least Herbrand model (wrt "$\subseteq$").

  For a program $\mathcal{P}$, this model is denoted *MM*$(\mathcal{P})$ (for "minimal model").

  The model *MM*$(\mathcal{P})$ is the semantics of $\mathcal{P}$.
- **Theorem (Datalog $\leftrightarrow$ Logic Programming).** Let P be a datalog program and $\mathbf{I}$ be an instance of $edb(P)$. Then,

$$P(\mathbf{I}) = \mathit{MM}(\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I}))$$

Consequences

Results and techniques for Logic Programming can be exploited for datalog.

For example,

- proof procedures for Logic Programming (e.g., SLD resolution) can be applied to datalog (with some caveats, regarding for instance termination)
- datalog can be reduced by “grounding” to propositional logic programs

Fixpoint Semantics

Another view:

"If all facts in $\mathbf{I}$ hold, which other facts must hold after firing the rules in P?"

Approach:

- Define an *immediate consequence operator* $\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K})$ on db instances $\mathbf{K}$.
- Start with $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{I}$.
- Apply $\mathbf{T}_P$ to obtain a new instance: $\mathbf{K}_{new} := \mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{I} \cup$ new facts.
- Iterate until nothing new can be produced.
- The result yields the semantics.

Immediate Consequence Operator

Let P be a datalog program and $\mathbf{K}$ be a database instance of $sch(P)$.

A fact $R(\vec{t})$ is an *immediate* consequence for $\mathbf{K}$ and P, if either

- $R \in edb(P)$ and $R(\vec{t}) \in \mathbf{K}$, or
- there exists a ground instance r of a rule in P such that $H(r) = R(\vec{t})$ and $B(r) \subseteq \mathbf{K}$.

Definition. The *immediate consequence operator* of a datalog program P is the mapping

$$\mathbf{T}_P \colon inst(sch(P)) \rightarrow inst(sch(P))$$

where

$$\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) = \{\ A \mid A \text{ is an immediate consequence for } \mathbf{K} \text{ and } P\ \}.$$

Example

Consider

$$P = \{ \quad \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{a})$$
$$\mathtt{reachable}(\mathtt{Y}) \leftarrow \mathtt{arc}(\mathtt{X}, \mathtt{Y}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathtt{X}) \; \}$$

where $edb(P) = \{\mathtt{arc}\}$ and $idb(P) = \{\mathtt{reachable}\}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I} = \mathbf{K}_1 \quad &= \quad \{\mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}),\ \mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{b}, \mathsf{c})\} \\
\mathbf{K}_2 \quad &= \quad \{\mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}),\ \mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{b}, \mathsf{c}),\ \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{a})\} \\
\mathbf{K}_3 \quad &= \quad \{\mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}),\ \mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{b}, \mathsf{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{a}),\ \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{b})\ \} \\
\mathbf{K}_4 \quad &= \quad \{\mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{a}, \mathsf{b}),\ \mathtt{arc}(\mathsf{b}, \mathsf{c}), \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{a}),\ \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{b}),\ \mathtt{reachable}(\mathsf{c})\}
\end{aligned}$$

Example (cntd)

Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}_1) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a},\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b},\texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a})\} \ = \ \mathbf{K}_2 \\
\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}_2) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a},\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b},\texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b})\} \ = \ \mathbf{K}_3 \\
\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}_3) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a},\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b},\texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{c})\} = \mathbf{K}_4 \\
\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}_4) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a},\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b},\texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{c})\} = \mathbf{K}_4
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, $\mathbf{K}_4$ is a *fixpoint* of $\mathbf{T}_P$.

Definition. $\mathbf{K}$ is a *fixpoint* of operator $\mathbf{T}_P$ if $\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{K}$.

Properties

Proposition. For every datalog program P we have:

1. The operator $\mathbf{T}_P$ is monotonic, that is, $\mathbf{K} \subseteq \mathbf{K}'$ implies $\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) \subseteq \mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}')$;
2. For any $\mathbf{K} \in inst(sch(P))$ we have:

   $$\mathbf{K} \text{ is a model of } \Sigma_P \text{ if and only if } \mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) \subseteq \mathbf{K};$$

3. If $\mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{K}) = \mathbf{K}$ (i.e., $\mathbf{K}$ is a fixpoint), then $\mathbf{K}$ is a model of Σ_P.

Note: The converse of 3. does not hold in general.

Datalog Semantics via Least Fixpoint

The semantics of P on database instance $\mathbf{I}$ of $edb(P)$ is a special fixpoint:

Theorem. Let P be a datalog program and $\mathbf{I}$ be a database instance. Then

1. $\mathbf{T}_P$ has a least (wrt "$\subseteq$") fixpoint containing $\mathbf{I}$, denoted $lfp(P, \mathbf{I})$.
2. Moreover, $lfp(P, \mathbf{I}) =$ *MM*$(\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I}))$ = P(**I**).

Advantage: Constructive definition of $P(\mathbf{I})$ by *fixpoint iteration*

Proof of Claim 2, first equality (Sketch): Let $M_1 := lfp(P, \mathbf{I})$ and $M_2 :=$ *MM*$(\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I}))$.

Since M_1 is a fixpoint of $\mathbf{T}_P$, it is a model of Σ_P, and since it contains $\mathbf{I}$ it is a model of $\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$. Hence, $M_2 \subseteq M_1$. Since M_2 is a model of $\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$, it holds that $\mathbf{T}_P(M_2) \subseteq M_2$. Note that for every model of $\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$ we have, due to the monotonicity of $\mathbf{T}_P$, that $\mathbf{T}_P(M)$ is model. Hence, $\mathbf{T}_P(M_2) = M_2$, since M_2 is a minimal model. This implies that M_2 is a fixpoint, hence $M_1 \subseteq M_2$.

Fixpoint Iteration

For a datalog program P and database instance $\mathbf{I}$, define the sequence $(\mathbf{I}_i)_{i \geq 0}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_0 &= \mathbf{I} \\ \mathbf{I}_i &= \mathbf{T}_P(\mathbf{I}_{i-1}) \qquad \text{for } i > 0. \end{aligned}$$

- By monotoncity of $\mathbf{T}_P$, we have $\mathbf{I}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{I}_2 \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathbf{I}_i \subseteq \mathbf{I}_{i+1} \subseteq \cdots$
- For every $i \geq 0$, we have $\mathbf{I}_i \subseteq \mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})$
- Hence, for some integer $n \leq |\mathbf{B}(P, \mathbf{I})|$, we have $\mathbf{I}_{n+1} = \mathbf{I}_n$ (=: $\mathbf{T}_P^\omega(\mathbf{I})$)
- It holds that $\mathbf{T}_P^\omega(\mathbf{I}) = \mathit{lfp}(P, \mathbf{I}) = P(\mathbf{I})$.

This can be readily implemented by an algorithm.

Example

$$P = \{ \quad \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a})$$
$$\texttt{reachable}(\texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \texttt{arc}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{X}) \ \}$$

$$\mathbf{I} \quad = \quad \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c})\}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{I}_0 &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c})\} \\
\mathbf{I}_1 = \mathbf{T}_P^1(\mathbf{I}) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a})\} \\
\mathbf{I}_2 = \mathbf{T}_P^2(\mathbf{I}) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b})\} \\
\mathbf{I}_3 = \mathbf{T}_P^3(\mathbf{I}) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{c})\} \\
\mathbf{I}_4 = \mathbf{T}_P^4(\mathbf{I}) &= \{\texttt{arc}(\texttt{a}, \texttt{b}),\ \texttt{arc}(\texttt{b}, \texttt{c}), \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{a}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{b}),\ \texttt{reachable}(\texttt{c})\} \\
&= \mathbf{T}_P^3(\mathbf{I})
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbf{T}_P^\omega(\mathbf{I}) = \mathit{lfp}(P, \mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{I}_4$.

Proof-Theoretic Approach

Basic idea: The answer of a datalog program P on $\mathbf{I}$ is given by the set of facts which can be *proved* from P and $\mathbf{I}$.

Definition. A *proof tree* for a fact A from $\mathbf{I}$ and P is a labeled finite tree T such that

- each vertex of T is labeled by a fact
- the root of T is labeled by A
- each leaf of T is labeled by a fact in $\mathbf{I}$
- if a non-leaf of T is labeled with A_1 and its children are labeled with $A_2, \ldots, A_n$, then there exists a ground instance r of a rule in P such that $H(r) = A_1$ and $B(r) = \{A_2, \ldots, A_n\}$

Example (Same Generation)

$$P = \{ \quad r_1: \quad \mathtt{sgc}(\mathtt{X},\mathtt{X}) \leftarrow \mathtt{person}(\mathtt{X})$$

$$r_2: \quad \mathtt{sgc}(\mathtt{X},\mathtt{Y}) \leftarrow \mathtt{par}(\mathtt{X},\mathtt{X1}), \mathtt{sgc}(\mathtt{X1},\mathtt{Y1}), \mathtt{par}(\mathtt{Y},\mathtt{Y1}) \,\}$$

where $edb(P) = \{\mathtt{person}, \mathtt{par}\}$ and $idb(P) = \{\mathtt{sgc}\}$

Consider $\mathbf{I}$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{I}(person) = \{ \quad \langle ann \rangle, \ \langle bertrand \rangle, \ \langle charles \rangle, \langle dorothy \rangle,$$

$$\langle evelyn \rangle, \langle fred \rangle, \ \langle george \rangle, \ \langle hilary \rangle \}$$

$$\mathbf{I}(par) = \{ \quad \langle dorothy, george \rangle, \ \langle evelyn, george \rangle, \ \langle bertrand, dorothy \rangle,$$

$$\langle ann, dorothy \rangle, \ \langle hilary, ann \rangle, \ \langle charles, evelyn \rangle \}.$$

Example (Same Generation)/2

Proof tree for $A = \texttt{sgc}(\texttt{ann}, \texttt{charles})$ from $\mathbf{I}$ and P:



Proof Tree Construction

Different ways to construct a proof tree for A from P and $\mathbf{I}$ exist

- ***Bottom Up construction:*** From leaves to root

  Intimately related to fixpoint approach

  - Define $S \vdash_P B$ to prove fact B from facts S if $B \in S$ or by a rule in P
  - Give $S = \mathbf{I}$ for granted

- ***Top Down construction:*** From root to leaves

  In Logic Programming view, consider program $\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$.

  - This amounts to a set of logical sentences $H_{\mathcal{P}(P,\mathbf{I})}$ of the form

$$\forall x_1 \cdots \forall x_m (R_1(\vec{x}_1) \vee \neg R_2(\vec{x}_2) \vee \neg R_3(\vec{x}_3) \vee \cdots \vee \neg R_n(\vec{x}_n))$$

  - Prove $A = R(\vec{t})$ via resolution refutation, that is, that $H_{\mathcal{P}(P,\mathbf{I})} \cup \{\neg A\}$ is unsatisfiable.

Datalog and SLD Resolution

- Logic Programming uses SLD resolution
- SLD: Selection Rule Driven Linear Resolution for Definite Clauses
- For datalog programs P on $\mathbf{I}$, resp. $\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})$, things are simpler than for general logic programs (no function symbols, unification is easy)
- Also non-ground atoms can be handled (e.g., $\mathtt{sgc}(\mathtt{ann}, \mathtt{X})$)

Let $SLD(\mathcal{P})$ be the set of ground atoms provable with SLD Resolution from $\mathcal{P}$.

Theorem. For any datalog program P and database instance $\mathbf{I}$,

$$SLD(\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I})) = P(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{T}^{\infty}_{\mathcal{P}(P,\mathbf{I})} = \mathit{lfp}(\mathbf{T}_{\mathcal{P}(P,\mathbf{I})}) = MM(\mathcal{P}(P, \mathbf{I}))$$

SLD Resolution – Termination

- Notice: Selection rule for next rule / atom to be considered for resolution might affect termination
- Prolog's strategy (leftmost atom / first rule) is problematic

Example:

$$\mathtt{child\_of}(\mathtt{karl}, \mathtt{franz}).$$
$$\mathtt{child\_of}(\mathtt{franz}, \mathtt{frieda}).$$
$$\mathtt{child\_of}(\mathtt{frieda}, \mathtt{pia}).$$
$$\mathtt{descendent\_of}(\mathtt{X}, \mathtt{Y}) \leftarrow \mathtt{child\_of}(\mathtt{X}, \mathtt{Y}).$$
$$\mathtt{descendent\_of}(\mathtt{X}, \mathtt{Y}) \leftarrow \mathtt{child\_of}(\mathtt{X}, \mathtt{Z}), \mathtt{descendent\_of}(\mathtt{Z}, \mathtt{Y}).$$
$$\leftarrow \mathtt{descendent\_of}(\mathtt{karl}, \mathtt{X}).$$

SLD Resolution – Termination /2

$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{karl}, \texttt{franz}).$

$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{franz}, \texttt{frieda}).$

$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{frieda}, \texttt{pia}).$

$\texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}).$

$\texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \mathsf{descendent\_of}(\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Z}), \mathsf{child\_of}(\mathsf{Z}, \mathsf{Y}).$

$\leftarrow \texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{karl}, \texttt{X}).$

SLD Resolution – Termination /3

$$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{karl}, \texttt{franz}).$$

$$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{franz}, \texttt{frieda}).$$

$$\texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{frieda}, \texttt{pia}).$$

$$\texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \texttt{child\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}).$$

$$\texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Y}) \leftarrow \texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{X}, \texttt{Z}),$$
$$\texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{Z}, \texttt{Y}).$$

$$\leftarrow \texttt{descendent\_of}(\texttt{karl}, \texttt{X}).$$