

Re: SQL Server 2000 RDBMS or DBMS?

Source:

<http://www.tech-archive.net/Archive/SQL-Server/microsoft.public.sqlserver.programming/2004-10/1254.html>

From: Tibor Karaszi (*tibor_please.no.email_karaszi_at_hotmail.nomail.com*)

Date: 10/06/04

Date: Wed, 6 Oct 2004 11:58:05 +0200

None of the SQL based DBMS's out there are relational. I guess a DBMS can enforce uniqueness for the whole row if you don't define a PK, or demand that you define a PK (else refuse to create a table).

But there are other things in the SQL language that makes it non-relational. Just the simple fact that the result of a query is supposed to be a table (relation) and the SQL language allow for duplicates in a resultset. I'm sure we can go on and on about this. Chris Date has written numerous texts on the subject, check out any of hit critiques of the SQL language.

I haven't played with Tutorial D (did I get the name right?), but this is supposed to be based on a new language (or perhaps Tutorial D *is* the language) which I take it adheres better to the relational model.

IMO, SQL is here to stay, as least for a few more decades. Too much investment...

--

Tibor Karaszi, SQL Server MVP

<http://www.karaszi.com/sqlserver/default.asp>

<http://www.solidqualitylearning.com/>

"Drew" <agarwalp@lucent.com> wrote in message news:e\$fmNf4qEHA.3900@TK2MSFTNGP10.phx.gbl...

>I was reading a monster thread on whether DBMS or RDBMS. Many of them said
> that since MS Access allows the users to create table without primary key,
> therefore it is not RDBMS. My Question even Sql Server allows tables without
> primary key. So it also not RDBMS ?

>

> Thanks

>

>