The Relational Database Dictionary: A Comprehensive Glossary Of Relational Terms And Concepts, With Illustrative Examples
Synopsis

Avoid misunderstandings that can affect the design, programming, and use of database systems. Whether you're using Oracle, DB2, SQL Server, MySQL, or PostgreSQL, The Relational Database Dictionary will prevent confusion about the precise meaning of database-related terms (e.g., attribute, 3NF, one-to-many correspondence, predicate, repeating group, join dependency), helping to ensure the success of your database projects. Carefully reviewed for clarity, accuracy, and completeness, this authoritative and comprehensive quick-reference contains more than 600 terms, many with examples, covering issues and concepts arising from the relational model of data. This one-of-a-kind dictionary provides a single, compact source where DBAs, database designers, DBMS implementers, application developers, and database professors and students can find the accurate definitions they need on a daily basis, information that isn't readily available anywhere else. If you're working with or learning about relational databases, you need this pocket-sized quick-reference.
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The subtitle to this book is "Terms, Concepts and Examples." It definitely is full of RDBMS terms. I do sympathize with the reviewer who found the language a bit terse and perhaps is a reason to consider the author aloof. I decided to look up "inner join." It was given as a question I received in an interview once. The definition contrasts the "inner" version against the "outer" version, which it then immediately states won't be discussed further (and isn't). I find it a bit challenging to use a term that you won't define as part of a definition for a term that you (supposedly) define...only to be redirected to "Join." However, these are what I consider to be "style" issues more than "substance" issues in the considerable bulk of the content. The examples are a bit esoteric. Under "INSERT" we have a definition that starts out with the word "Loosely." When was the last time that you saw a "regular" dictionary start a definition with the word loosely to describe the generality of the definition? I don't agree that financial success or volumes of units sold indicate the quality of a book. This one could definitely be better in some measurable ways, but how? Remember when you were like in 3rd grade and you weren't allowed to use the "word" as part of the definition? How about "inheritance?" ...with the definition being "Type inheritance." At least even the most abbreviated dictionaries use complete sentences. "relvar" as a word in a definition? When you have to use the dictionary to look up a term in the definition of a term, you know that you're chasing your tail.
