

Contents

	Preface	ix
	Terminology and Conventions	xiii
CHAPTER I.	Étale Morphisms	3
§1.	Finite and Quasi-finite Morphisms	4
§2.	Flat Morphisms	7
§3.	Étale Morphisms	20
§4.	Henselian Rings	32
§5.	The Fundamental Group: Galois Coverings	39
CHAPTER II.	Sheaf Theory	46
§1.	Presheaves and Sheaves	46
§2.	The Category of Sheaves	56
§3.	Direct and Inverse Images of Sheaves	68
CHAPTER III.	Cohomology	82
§1.	Cohomology	82
§2.	Čech Cohomology	95
§3.	Comparison of Topologies	110
§4.	Principal Homogeneous Spaces	120
CHAPTER IV.	The Brauer Group	136
§1.	The Brauer Group of a Local Ring	136
§2.	The Brauer Group of a Scheme	140
CHAPTER V.	The Cohomology of Curves and Surfaces	155
§1.	Constructible Sheaves: Pairings	155
§2.	The Cohomology of Curves	175
§3.	The Cohomology of Surfaces	197
CHAPTER VI.	The Fundamental Theorems	220
§1.	Cohomological Dimension	220
§2.	The Proper Base Change and Finiteness Theorems	222
§3.	Higher Direct Images with Compact Support	227
§4.	The Smooth Base Change Theorem	230

CONTENTS

§5.	Purity	241
§6.	The Fundamental Class	247
§7.	The Weak Lefschetz Theorem	253
§8.	The Künneth Formula	256
§9.	The Cycle Map	268
§10.	Chern Classes	271
§11.	The Poincaré Duality Theorem	276
§12.	The Rationality of the Zeta Function	286
§13.	The Rationality of L-Series	289
APPENDIX A.	Limits	304
APPENDIX B.	Spectral Sequences	307
APPENDIX C.	Hypercohomology	310
	Bibliography	313
	Index	321

© Copyright, Princeton University Press. No part of this book may be distributed, posted, or reproduced in any form by digital or mechanical means without prior written permission of the publisher.

Étale Cohomology

© Copyright, Princeton University Press. No part of this book may be distributed, posted, or reproduced in any form by digital or mechanical means without prior written permission of the publisher.

CHAPTER I

Étale Morphisms

A flat morphism is the algebraic analogue of a map whose fibers form a continuously varying family. For example, a surjective morphism of smooth varieties is flat if and only if all fibers have the same dimension. A finite morphism to a reduced scheme is flat if and only if, over any connected component, all fibers have the same number of points (counting multiplicities). The image of a flat morphism of finite-type is open, and flat morphisms that are surjective on the underlying spaces are epimorphisms in a very strong sense.

An étale morphism is a flat quasi-finite morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ with no ramification (that is, branch) points. Locally Y is then defined by an equation $T^m + a_1 T^{m-1} + \cdots + a_m = 0$, where a_1, \dots, a_m are functions on an open subset U of X and all roots of the equation over a point of U are simple. An étale morphism induces isomorphisms on the tangent spaces and so might be expected to be a local isomorphism. This is true over the complex numbers if local is meant in the sense of the complex topology, but the Zariski topology is too coarse for this to hold algebraically. However, an étale morphism induces an isomorphism on the completions of the local rings at a point where there is no residue field extension. Moreover, it has all the uniqueness properties of a local isomorphism.

A local scheme is Henselian if, for any scheme étale over it, any section of the closed fiber extends to a section of the scheme. It is strictly Henselian, or strictly local, if any scheme étale and faithfully flat over it has a section. The strictly local rings play the same role for the étale topology as local rings play for the Zariski topology.

The fundamental group of a scheme classifies finite étale coverings of it. For a smooth variety over the complex numbers, the algebraic fundamental group is simply the profinite completion of the topological fundamental group. There are algebraic analogues for many of the results on the topological fundamental group.

§1. Finite and Quasi-Finite Morphisms

Recall that a morphism of schemes $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is *affine* if the inverse image of any open affine subset U of X is an open affine subset of Y . If, moreover, $\Gamma(f^{-1}(U), \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is a finite $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$ -algebra for every such U , then f is said to be *finite*. These conditions need only be checked for all U in some open affine covering of X (Mumford [3, III.1, Prop. 5]).

Examples of finite morphisms abound. Let X be an integral scheme with field of rational functions $R(X)$, and let L be a finite field extension of $R(X)$. The *normalization* of X in L is a pair (X', f) where X' is an integral scheme with $R(X') = L$ and $f: X' \rightarrow X$ is an affine morphism such that, for all open affines U of X , $\Gamma(f^{-1}(U), \mathcal{O}_{X'})$ is the integral closure of $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$ in L .

PROPOSITION 1.1. *If X is normal and $f: X' \rightarrow X$ is the normalization of X in some finite separable extension of $R(X)$, then f is finite.*

Proof. One has only to show that $\Gamma(f^{-1}(U), \mathcal{O}_{X'})$ is a finite $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$ -algebra for U an open affine in X , but this is done in Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 5.17].

Remark 1.2. The above proposition holds for many schemes X without the separability assumption, for example, for reduced excellent schemes and so for varieties ([EGA. IV.7.8] and Bourbaki [2, V.3.2]). (A field is excellent and a Dedekind domain A is excellent if the completion \hat{K} of its field of fractions K at any maximal ideal of A is separable over K ; any scheme of finite type over an excellent scheme is excellent.)

PROPOSITION 1.3. (a) *A closed immersion is finite.*

(b) *The composite of two finite morphisms is finite.*

(c) *Any base change of a finite morphism is finite, that is, if $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is finite, then so also is $f_{(X')} : Y_{(X')} \rightarrow X'$ for any morphism $X' \rightarrow X$.*

Proof. These reduce easily to statements about rings, all of which are obvious.

The “going up” theorem of Cohen-Seidenberg has the following geometric interpretation.

PROPOSITION 1.4. *Any finite morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is proper, that is, it is separated, of finite-type, and universally closed.*

Proof. For any open affine covering (U_i) of X , f restricted to $f^{-1}(U_i) \rightarrow U_i$ is separated for all i , and so f is separated. (Hartshorne [2, II.4.6]). To show that finite morphisms are universally closed it suffices, according to (1.3c), to show that they are closed, and for this it suffices, according to (1.3a,b), to show that they map the whole space onto a closed set. Thus we must show that $f(Y)$ is closed. This re-

duces easily to the affine case with, for example, $f = {}^a g$ where $g: A \rightarrow B$ is finite. Let $\mathfrak{I} = \ker(g)$. Then f factors into $\text{spec } B \rightarrow \text{spec } A/\mathfrak{I} \rightarrow \text{spec } A$. The first map is surjective (Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 5.10]), and the second is a closed immersion.

For morphisms $X \rightarrow \text{spec } k$, with k a field, there is a topological characterization of finiteness.

PROPOSITION 1.5. *Let $f: X \rightarrow \text{spec } k$ be a morphism of finite-type with k a field. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) X is affine and $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is an Artin ring;
- (b) X is finite and discrete (as a topological space);
- (c) X is discrete;
- (d) f is finite.

Proof. See Atiyah-Macdonald [1, Chapter VIII, especially exercises 2, 3, 4].

A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is *quasi-finite* if it is of finite-type and has finite fibers, that is, $f^{-1}(x)$ is discrete (and hence finite) for all $x \in X$. Similarly an A -algebra B is *quasi-finite* if it is of finite-type and if $B \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p})$ is a finite $k(\mathfrak{p})$ -algebra for all prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$.

Exercise 1.6. (a) Let A be a discrete valuation ring. Show that $A[T]/(P(T))$ is a quasi-finite A -algebra if and only if some coefficient of $P(T)$ is a unit, and that it is finite if and only if the leading coefficient of $P(T)$ is a unit.

(b) Let A be a Dedekind domain with field of fractions K . Show that $\text{spec } K \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ is never finite, that it is quasi-finite if it is of finite-type, and that it is of finite-type if and only if A has only finitely many prime ideals.

PROPOSITION 1.7. (a) *Any immersion is quasi-finite.*

(b) *The composite of two quasi-finite morphisms is quasi-finite.*

(c) *Any base change of a quasi-finite morphism is quasi-finite.*

Proof. (a) Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be an immersion. Clearly f has finite fibers, and to show that it is of finite-type it suffices to show that $f^{-1}(U)$ is quasi-compact for any open affine U in X . But U is a Noetherian topological space (recall that all schemes are locally Noetherian), and $f^{-1}(U) = U \cap Y$ is a subset of U .

(b) This is obvious.

(c) Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be quasi-finite and $X' \rightarrow X$ arbitrary. If $x' \mapsto x$ under $X' \rightarrow X$, then the fiber

$$f_{(X')}^{-1}(x') = f^{-1}(x) \otimes_{k(x)} k(x')$$

and hence is discrete.

If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is finite and U is an open subscheme of Y , then it follows from the above proposition that $U \rightarrow X$ is quasi-finite. The remarkable thing is that essentially every quasi-finite morphism comes in this way.

THEOREM 1.8. (Zariski's Main Theorem). *If X is a quasi-compact, then any separated, quasi-finite morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ factors as $Y \xrightarrow{f'} Y' \xrightarrow{g} X$ where f' is an open immersion and g is finite.*

Proof. The most elementary proof may be found in Raynaud [3, Chapter IV]. We sketch the deduction of (1.8) from the following affine form of it, proved in Raynaud [3, p. 42]: let B be an A -algebra that is quasi-finite, and let A' be the integral closure of A in B ; then the map $\text{spec } B \rightarrow \text{spec } A'$ is an open immersion.

Consider a scheme X . Associated with any quasi-coherent sheaf A of \mathcal{O}_X -algebras, there is a pair (X', g) where X' is a scheme and $g: X' \rightarrow X$ is an affine morphism such that $g_*\mathcal{O}_{X'} = A$ (Hartshorne [2, II. Ex. 5.17] and [EGA. I.9.1.4]). One writes $X' = \text{spec } A$. For any X -scheme $Y \xrightarrow{f} X$, to give an X -morphism $Y \rightarrow X'$ is the same as to give a homomorphism $A \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ of \mathcal{O}_X -algebras.

Now let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be separated and of finite-type. Then $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ is a quasi-coherent \mathcal{O}_X -algebra [EGA. I.6.7.1], and the \mathcal{O}_X -algebra A' such that $\Gamma(U, A')$ is the integral closure of $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$ in $\Gamma(U, f_*\mathcal{O}_Y)$ for all open affines $U \subset X$ is also quasi-coherent [EGA. II.6.3.4]. The associated X -scheme $X' = \text{spec } A'$ is called the normalization of X in Y .

Assume further that f is quasi-finite. It follows easily from the affine result quoted above, that the morphism $Y \rightarrow X'$ induced by the inclusion $A' \subset f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ is an open immersion. Now let (A_i) be the family of all coherent \mathcal{O}_X -subalgebras of A' . One checks easily that the morphism $Y \rightarrow \text{spec } A_i$, induced by the inclusion $A_i \subset f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$, is an open immersion for all sufficiently large A_i (using the fact that $A' = \bigcup A_i$; compare the proof of Raynaud [3, p. 42, Cor. 2(2)]). Since $\text{spec } A_i$ is finite over X , this proves (1.8).

Remark 1.9. Zariski's main theorem is, more correctly, the main theorem of Zariski [2]. There he was interested in the behavior of a singularity on a normal variety under a birational map. The original statement is essentially that if $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a birational morphism of varieties and $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ is integrally closed, then either $f^{-1}(x)$ consists of one point and the inverse morphism f^{-1} is defined in a neighborhood of x or all components of $f^{-1}(x)$ have dimension ≥ 1 . To relate this to Grothendieck's version, note that if in (1.8) X and Y are varieties, f is birational and X is normal, then g is an isomorphism. For a more complete discussion of the theorem, see Mumford [3, III.9].

COROLLARY 1.10. *Any proper, quasi-finite morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is finite.*

Proof. Let $f = gf'$ be the factorization as in (1.8). As g is separated and f is proper, f' is proper. (Use the factorization

$$f' = f_{(Y')} \circ \Gamma_{f'}: Y \rightarrow Y \times_X Y' \rightarrow Y')$$

Thus f' is an immersion with closed image, that is, a closed immersion. Now both f' and g are finite.

Remark 1.11. The separatedness is necessary in both of the above results; for if X is the affine line with the “origin doubled” (Hartshorne [2, II.2.3.6]), and $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ is the natural map, then f is universally closed and quasi-finite, but is not finite. (It is even flat and étale; see the next two sections.)

Exercise 1.12. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be separated and of finite-type with X irreducible. Show that if the fiber over the generic point η is finite, then there is an open neighborhood U of η in X such that $f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is finite.

§2. Flat Morphisms

A homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of rings is *flat* if B is flat when regarded as an A -module via f . Thus, f is flat if and only if the functor $- \otimes_A B$ from A -modules to B -modules is exact. In particular, if \mathfrak{I} is any ideal of A and f is flat, then $\mathfrak{I} \otimes_A B \rightarrow A \otimes_A B = B$ is injective. The converse to this statement is also true.

PROPOSITION 2.1. *A homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is flat if $(a \otimes b \mapsto f(ab): \mathfrak{I} \otimes_A B \rightarrow B$ is injective for all ideals \mathfrak{I} in A .*

Proof. Let $g: M' \rightarrow M$ be an injective map of A -modules where, following Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 2, 19], we may assume M to be finitely generated.

Case (a) M is free. We prove this case by induction on the rank r of M . If $r = 1$, then we may identify M with A and M' with an ideal in A ; then the statement to be proved is the statement given. If $r > 1$, then $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$ with M_1 and M_2 free of rank $< r$. Consider the exact commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & M_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow g_1 & & \uparrow g & & \uparrow g_2 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & g^{-1}(M_1) & \longrightarrow & M' & \longrightarrow & pg(M') & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

When tensored with B , the top row remains exact, and g_1 and g_2 remain injective. This implies that $g \otimes 1$ is injective.

Case (b) M arbitrary (finitely generated). Let x_1, \dots, x_r generate M , let M^* be the free A -module on x_1, \dots, x_r , and consider the exact

commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \xrightarrow{j} & M^* & \xrightarrow{h} & M \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \uparrow i & & \uparrow g \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & h^{-1}g(M') & \longrightarrow & M' \longrightarrow 0.
 \end{array}$$

By case (a) $i \otimes 1$ is injective, and it follows that $g \otimes 1$ is injective.

PROPOSITION 2.2. *If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is flat, then so also is $S^{-1}A \rightarrow T^{-1}B$ for all multiplicative subsets $S \subset A$ and $T \subset B$ such that $f(S) \subset T$. Conversely, if $A_{f^{-1}(\mathfrak{n})} \rightarrow B_{\mathfrak{n}}$ is flat for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{n} of B , then $A \rightarrow B$ is flat.*

Proof. $S^{-1}A \rightarrow S^{-1}B$ is flat according to Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 2.20], and $S^{-1}B \rightarrow T^{-1}B$ is flat according to Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 3.6]. For the converse, let $M' \rightarrow M$ be an injective map of A -modules. To show that $B \otimes_A M' \rightarrow B \otimes_A M$ is injective, it suffices to show that

$$B_{\mathfrak{n}} \otimes_B (B \otimes_A M') \rightarrow B_{\mathfrak{n}} \otimes_B (B \otimes_A M)$$

is injective for all \mathfrak{n} , but this follows from the flatness of $A_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow B_{\mathfrak{n}}$ with $\mathfrak{p} = f^{-1}(\mathfrak{n})$ and the isomorphism $B_{\mathfrak{n}} \otimes_B (B \otimes_A N) \approx B_{\mathfrak{n}} \otimes_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}} (A_{\mathfrak{p}} \otimes_A N)$, which exists for any A -module N .

Remark 2.3. If $a \in A$ is not a zero-divisor and $f: A \rightarrow B$ is flat, then $f(a)$ is not a zero-divisor in B because the injectivity of $(x \mapsto ax): A \rightarrow A$ implies that of $(x \mapsto f(a)x): B \rightarrow B = A \otimes_A B$. Thus, if A is an integral domain and $B \neq 0$, then f is injective. Conversely, any injective homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$, where A is a Dedekind domain and B is an integral domain, is flat. In proving this, we may localize and hence assume that A is principal. According to (2.1), it suffices to prove that for any ideal $\mathfrak{I} \neq 0$ of A , $\mathfrak{I} \otimes_A B \rightarrow B$ is injective, but $\mathfrak{I} \otimes_A B$ is a free B -module of rank one, and we know that the generator of \mathfrak{I} is not mapped to zero in B .

A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ of schemes is *flat* if, for all points y of Y , the induced map $\mathcal{O}_{X, f(y)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$ is flat. Equivalently f is flat if for any pair V and U of open affines of Y and X such that $f(V) \subset U$, the map $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow \Gamma(V, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is flat. From (2.2) it follows that the first condition needs only to be checked for closed points y of Y .

- PROPOSITION 2.4.** (a) *An open immersion is flat.*
 (b) *The composite of two flat morphisms is flat.*
 (c) *Any base extension of a flat morphism is flat.*

Proof. (a) and (b) are obvious.

(c) If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is flat and $A \rightarrow A'$ is arbitrary, then to see that $A' \rightarrow B \otimes_A A'$ is flat, one may use the canonical isomorphism $(B \otimes_A A') \otimes_{A'} M \approx B \otimes_A M$, which exists for any A' -module M .

In order to get less trivial examples of flat morphisms we shall need the following criterion.

PROPOSITION 2.5. *Let B be a flat A -algebra, and consider $b \in B$. If the image of b in $B/\mathfrak{m}B$ is not a zero-divisor for any maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A , then $B/(b)$ is a flat A -algebra.*

Proof. After applying (2.2), we may assume that $A \rightarrow B$ is a local homomorphism of local rings. By assumption, if $c \in B$ and $bc = 0$, then $c \in \mathfrak{m}B$. We shall show by induction that in fact $c \in \mathfrak{m}^r B$ for all r , and hence $c \in \bigcap \mathfrak{m}^r B \subset \bigcap \mathfrak{m}^r = (0)$, where \mathfrak{m} is the maximal ideal of B . Assume that $c \in \mathfrak{m}^r B$, and write

$$c = \sum a_i b_i$$

where the a_i form a minimal generating set for \mathfrak{m}^r . Then

$$0 = bc = \sum_i a_i b_i b,$$

and so, by one of the standard flatness criteria (proved in (2.10b') below), there are equations

$$b_i b = \sum_j a_{ij} b'_j$$

with the $b'_j \in B$, $a_{ij} \in A$ such that

$$\sum_i a_i a_{ij} = 0$$

for all j . From the choice of the a_i , all $a_{ij} \in \mathfrak{m}$. Thus $b_i b \in \mathfrak{m}B$, and since b is not a zero-divisor in $B/\mathfrak{m}B$, this implies that $b_i \in \mathfrak{m}B$. Thus $c \in \mathfrak{m}^{r+1} B$, which completes the induction. We have shown that b is not a zero-divisor in B , and the same argument, with A replaced by A/\mathfrak{I} and B by $B/\mathfrak{I}B$, shows that b is not a zero-divisor in $B/\mathfrak{I}B$ for any ideal \mathfrak{I} of A .

Fix such an ideal, and consider the exact commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \mathfrak{I} \otimes B & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{I} \otimes B & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{I} \otimes (B/(b)) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & B & \xrightarrow{b} & B & \longrightarrow & B/(b) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & B/\mathfrak{I}B & \xrightarrow{b} & B/\mathfrak{I}B & \longrightarrow & (B/(b))/\mathfrak{I}(B/(b)) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

in which b means multiplication by b . An application of the snake lemma shows that $\mathfrak{I} \otimes B/(b) \rightarrow B/(b)$ is injective, which shows that $B/(b)$ is flat over A , according to (2.1).

Remarks 2.6. (a) For any ring A , $A[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ is a free A -module, and so \mathbb{A}_A^n is flat over A . Let Z be a hypersurface in \mathbb{A}_A^n , that is, a scheme of the form $\text{spec}(A[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(P))$, $P \neq 0$. Then (2.5) shows that Z is flat over $\text{spec } A \Leftrightarrow$ for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} of A , $Z \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \mathbb{A}_{k(\mathfrak{m})}^n \Leftrightarrow$ the ideal generated by the coefficients of P is A (assuming that $\text{spec } A$ is connected). Similar statements hold for hypersurfaces in \mathbb{P}_A^n .

(b) We may restate (a) as follows: a hypersurface Z is flat if and only if its closed fibers over $\text{spec } A$ all have the same dimension. This generalizes. Firstly, if $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is flat, then

$$\dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y_x, y}) = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y, y}) - \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X, x}),$$

where $x = f(y)$. For varieties this means that $\dim(Y_x) = \dim(Y) - \dim(X)$ for any closed point x of X with Y_x nonempty. The proof, which is quite elementary, may be found in [EGA. IV.6.1] or Hartshorne [2, III.9.5]. Secondly, if X and Y are regular schemes and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is such that

$$\dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y_x, y}) = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y, y}) - \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X, x})$$

for all closed points y of Y , where $x = f(y)$, then f is flat. The proof again may be found in [EGA. IV.6.1]. (See also Hartshorne [2, III. Ex. 10.9].)

(c) There is another criterion for flatness that is frequently very useful. It is easy to construct examples $Z \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} X$ in which g and gf are flat, but f is not flat. However, if one also knows that the maps on fibers $f_x: Z_x \rightarrow Y_x$ are flat for all closed $x \in X$, then f is flat ([SGA. 1, IV.5.9], or Bourbaki [2, III.5.4 Prop. 2,3]).

(d) If B is flat over A and b_1, \dots, b_n is a sequence of elements of B whose image in $B/\mathfrak{m}B$ is regular for each maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A , that is, b_i is not a zero-divisor in $B/\mathfrak{m} + (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_{i-1})$ for any i , then $B/(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ is flat over A . This follows by induction from (2.5).

(e) There is a second generalization of (a). Let X be an integral scheme and Z a closed subscheme of \mathbb{P}_X^n ; for each $x \in X$, let $p_x \in \mathbb{Q}[T]$ be the Hilbert polynomial of the fiber $Z_x \subset \mathbb{P}_{k(x)}^n$; then Z is flat over X if and only if p_x is independent of x (Hartshorne [2, III.9.9]).

A flat morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ is *faithfully flat* if $B \otimes_A M$ is nonzero for any nonzero A -module M . On taking M to be a principal ideal in A , we see that such a morphism is injective.

PROPOSITION 2.7. *Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a flat morphism with $A \neq 0$. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) f is faithfully flat;
- (b) a sequence $M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M''$ of A -modules is exact whenever $B \otimes_A M' \rightarrow B \otimes_A M \rightarrow B \otimes_A M''$ is exact;
- (c) ${}^a f : \text{spec } B \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ is surjective;
- (d) for every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of A , $f(\mathfrak{m})B \neq B$. In particular, a flat local homomorphism of local rings is automatically faithfully flat.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b). Suppose that $M' \xrightarrow{g_1} M \xrightarrow{g_2} M''$ becomes exact after tensoring with B . Then $\text{im}(g_2 g_1) = 0$ because

$$B \otimes_A \text{im}(g_2 g_1) = \text{im}((1 \otimes g_2)(1 \otimes g_1)) = 0,$$

and $\text{im}(g_1) = \ker(g_2)$ because

$$B \otimes (\ker g_2 / \text{im } g_1) = \ker(1 \otimes g_2) / \text{im}(1 \otimes g_1) = 0.$$

(b) \Rightarrow (a). $M \xrightarrow{0} M \rightarrow 0$ is exact if and only if $M = 0$.

(a) \Rightarrow (c). For any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of A , $B \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p}) \neq 0$, and so ${}^a f^{-1}(\mathfrak{p}) = \text{spec}(B \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p}))$ is nonempty.

(c) \Rightarrow (d). This is trivial.

(d) \Rightarrow (a). Let $x \in M$, $x \neq 0$. Because f is flat, it suffices to show that $B \otimes_A N \neq 0$, where $N = Ax \subset M$. But $N \approx A/\mathfrak{I}$ for some ideal \mathfrak{I} of A , and hence $B \otimes N \approx B/\mathfrak{I}B$. If \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal of A containing \mathfrak{I} , then $\mathfrak{I}B \subset f(\mathfrak{m})B \neq B$, and so $B/\mathfrak{I}B \neq 0$.

COROLLARY 2.8. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be flat; let $y \in Y$, and let x' be such that $x = f(y)$ is in the closure $\overline{\{x'\}}$ of $\{x'\}$. Then there is a y' such that $y \in \overline{\{y'\}}$ and $f(y') = x'$.*

Proof. The x' such that $x \in \overline{\{x'\}}$ are exactly the points in the image of the canonical map $\text{spec } \mathcal{O}_x \rightarrow X$. The corollary therefore follows from the fact that the map $\text{spec } \mathcal{O}_y \rightarrow \text{spec } \mathcal{O}_x$ induced by f is surjective.

A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is *faithfully flat* if it is flat and surjective. According to (2.7c), this agrees with the previous definition for rings.

We now consider the question of flatness for finite morphisms. The next theorem shows that, for such a morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$, flatness has a very explicit interpretation in terms of the properties of $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y$ as an \mathcal{O}_X -module.

THEOREM 2.9. *Let M be a finitely generated A -module. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) M is flat;
- (b) $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is a free $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -module for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} of A ;
- (c) \tilde{M} is a locally free sheaf on $\text{spec } A$;
- (d) M is a projective A -module.

Moreover, if A is an integral domain, they are equivalent to:

- (e) $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{p})}(M \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p}))$ is the same for all prime ideals \mathfrak{p} of A .

Proof. (d) \Rightarrow (a). This implication does not use the finite generation of M . As tensor products commute with direct sums, any free module is flat, and any direct summand of a flat module is flat.

(b) \Rightarrow (c). Let \mathfrak{m} be a maximal ideal of A , and let x_1, \dots, x_r be elements of M whose images in $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ form a basis for $M_{\mathfrak{m}}$ over $A_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Then the homomorphism

$$g: A^r \rightarrow M, \quad g(a_1, \dots, a_r) = \sum a_i x_i,$$

induces an isomorphism $A_a^r \rightarrow M_a$ for some $a \in A$, $a \notin \mathfrak{m}$, because the kernel and cokernel of g are zero at \mathfrak{m} and, being finitely generated, have closed support in $\text{spec } A$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a). Let a_1, \dots, a_r be elements of A such that the ideal $(a_1, \dots, a_r) = A$ and M_{a_i} is a free A_{a_i} -module for all i . Let $B = \prod A_{a_i}$. Then B is faithfully flat over A , and $B \otimes_A M = \prod M_{a_i}$ is clearly a flat B -module. It follows that M is a flat A -module (apply (2.7b)).

To prove the remaining implications, (a) \Rightarrow (d), (a) \Rightarrow (b), we shall need the following lemma.

LEMMA 2.10. *Let $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow F \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of A -modules with N a submodule of F .*

(a) *If M and F are flat over A , then $N \cap \mathfrak{I}F = \mathfrak{I}N$ for all ideals \mathfrak{I} of A .*

(b) *Let M be flat and F free, with basis (y_i) over A . If*

$$n = \sum a_i y_i \in N,$$

then there exist $n_i \in N$ such that

$$n = \sum a_i n_i.$$

(b') *Let M be any flat A -module. If*

$$\sum_i a_i x_i = 0,$$

$a_i \in A$, $x_i \in M$, then there are equations

$$x_i = \sum_j a_{ij} x'_j$$

with $x'_j \in M$, $a_{ij} \in A$, such that

$$\sum_i a_i a_{ij} = 0$$

for all j .

(c) *Let M be flat and F free. For any finite set $\{n_1, \dots, n_r\}$ of elements of N , there exists an A -linear map $f: F \rightarrow N$ with $f(n_j) = n_j$, $j = 1, \dots, r$.*

Proof. a. From the given exact sequence, we obtain exact sequences,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow N \cap \mathfrak{I}F \longrightarrow \mathfrak{I}F \longrightarrow \mathfrak{I}M \longrightarrow 0, \\ \mathfrak{I} \otimes N &\longrightarrow \mathfrak{I} \otimes F \longrightarrow \mathfrak{I} \otimes M \longrightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

As M and F are flat, $\mathfrak{I} \otimes F$ and $\mathfrak{I} \otimes M$ may be identified with $\mathfrak{I}F$ and $\mathfrak{I}M$, and then the image of $\mathfrak{I} \otimes N$ in $\mathfrak{I} \otimes F = \mathfrak{I}F$ becomes identified with $\mathfrak{I}N$. But from the first sequence, this is also $N \cap \mathfrak{I}F$.

(b) Let \mathfrak{I} be the ideal generated by the a_i occurring in

$$n = \sum a_i y_i.$$

Then $n \in N \cap \mathfrak{I}F = \mathfrak{I}N$, and so there are $n_i \in N$ such that

$$n = \sum a_i n_i.$$

(b') Write M as a quotient of a free module, as in (b), and let $a_1 x_1 + \dots + a_r x_r = 0$. It is possible to choose F so that it has a basis (y_i) with $g(y_i) = x_i$, $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then

$$n = \sum a_i y_i \in N,$$

and so it may be written

$$n = \sum a_i n_i,$$

$n_i \in N$. Write

$$n_i = y_i - \sum a_{ij} y_j,$$

some a_{ij} . Then

$$n = \sum a_i n_i = n - \sum_j \sum_i (a_i a_{ij}) y_j,$$

and so

$$\sum_i a_i a_{ij} = 0$$

each j . Also

$$x_i = \sum a_{ij} g(y_j),$$

and so x'_j may be taken to be $g(y_j)$.

(c) We use induction on r . Assume first that $r = 1$, and write

$$n_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s a_j y_{i_j}$$

where (y_i) is a basis for F . Then

$$n_1 = \sum_{j=1}^s a_j n'_j$$

for some $n'_j \in N$, and f may be taken to be the map such that $f(y_{i_j}) = n'_j$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, and $f(y_i) = 0$ otherwise. Now suppose that $r > 1$, and

there are maps $f_1, f_2: F \rightarrow N$ such that $f_1(n_1) = n_1$ and

$$f_2(n_i - f_1(n_i)) = n_i - f_1(n_i), \quad i = 2, \dots, r.$$

Then

$$f: F \rightarrow N, \quad f(y) = f_1(y) + f_2(y) - f_2 f_1(y)$$

has the required property.

We now complete the proof of (2.9).

(a) \Rightarrow (d). Embed M into an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

in which F is free and N and F are both finitely generated. According to (2.10c), this sequence splits, and so M is projective.

(a) \Rightarrow (b). We may assume that M is a finitely generated flat module over a local ring A . Let $x_1, \dots, x_r \in M$ be such that their images in $M/\mathfrak{m}M$ form a basis for this over the field A/\mathfrak{m} . Embed M in a sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow F \xrightarrow{g} M \rightarrow 0$$

where F is free with basis $\{y_1, \dots, y_r\}$ and $g(y_i) = x_i$. As $N \subset \mathfrak{m}F$, $\mathfrak{m}N = N \cap (\mathfrak{m}F) = N$, and N is zero according to Nakayama's lemma.

(c) \Rightarrow (e). This is obvious.

(e) \Rightarrow (c). Fix a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of A , and choose elements x_1, \dots, x_r of M_a , some $a \notin \mathfrak{p}$, whose images in $M \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p})$ form a basis. According to Nakayama's lemma the map

$$g: A_a^r \rightarrow M_a, \quad g(a_1, \dots, a_r) = \sum a_i x_i$$

defines a surjection $A_a^r \rightarrow M_a$. On changing a , we may assume that g itself is surjective. For any prime ideal \mathfrak{q} of A_a , the map $k(\mathfrak{q})^r \rightarrow M \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{q})$ is surjective, and hence is an isomorphism because $\dim(M \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{q})) = r$. Thus $\ker(g) \subset \mathfrak{q}A_a^r$ for any \mathfrak{q} , which implies that it is zero as A_a is reduced. Thus M_a is free.

Remark 2.11. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be finite and flat. I claim that f is open. Following (2.9), we may assume that $X = \text{spec } A$, $Y = \text{spec } B$, and $B \approx A^r$ as an A -module. Let $T^r + a_1 T^{r-1} + \dots + a_r$ be the characteristic polynomial over A of an element $b \in B$. A prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of A is in the image of $\text{spec}(B_b) \rightarrow \text{spec}(A)$ exactly when $B_b/\mathfrak{p}B_b$ is nonzero. But $B_b/\mathfrak{p}B_b \approx (B/\mathfrak{p}B)_{\bar{b}}$ and so this ring is nonzero exactly when \bar{b} is not nilpotent in $B/\mathfrak{p}B$ or, equivalently, when some coefficient of $T^r + a_1 T^{r-1} + \dots + a_r$ is nonzero in A/\mathfrak{p} . Thus the image of $\text{spec } B_b$ in $\text{spec } A$ is $\bigcup \text{spec } A_{a_i}$, which is open. A much more general statement holds.

THEOREM 2.12. *Any flat morphism that is locally of finite-type is open.*

LEMMA 2.13. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be of finite-type. For all pairs (Z, U) where Z is a closed irreducible subset of Y and U is an open subset such that*

$U \cap Z \neq \emptyset$, there is an open subset V of X such that $f(U \cap Z) \supset V \cap \overline{f(Z)} \neq \emptyset$. (Here, $\overline{f(Z)}$ denotes the closure of the set $f(Z)$).

Proof. First note the following statements.

- (a) The lemma is true for closed immersions.
- (b) The lemma is true for f if it is true for

$$f_{\text{red}}: Y_{\text{red}} \rightarrow X_{\text{red}}.$$

- (c) The lemma is true for gf if it is true for f and g .

For, if V' satisfies the conclusion of the lemma for the pair $(\overline{f(Z)}, V)$ and the map g , then it also satisfies the conclusion for the pair (Z, U) and the map gf .

- (d) It suffices to check the lemma locally on Y and X .

(e) In checking the lemma for a given Z , we note that X may be replaced by $\overline{f(Z)}$, and hence may be assumed to be irreducible.

Using (a), (c), and (d), we may reduce the proof to the case that f is the projection $\mathbb{A}^n \times X \rightarrow X$ where X is affine. Using (b) and (e), we reduce the proof further to the case that $X = \text{spec } A$, A an integral domain. Finally, using (c) again, we reduce the proof to the case that f is the projection $\mathbb{A}^1 \times X \rightarrow X$.

Let Z be a closed irreducible subset of \mathbb{A}_X^1 , say $Z = \text{spec } B$ where $B = A[T]/\mathfrak{q}$. We may assume that $\mathfrak{q} \neq 0$, for otherwise the lemma is easy. We may also assume, according to (e), that $\mathfrak{q} \cap A = (0)$, that is, that $f(Z) = X$. Let K be the field of fractions of A , and let $t = T \pmod{\mathfrak{q}}$. Since \mathfrak{q} contains a nonconstant polynomial, t is algebraic over K , and so there is an $a \in A$, $a \neq 0$, such that at is integral over A . Then B_a is finite over A_a , and so $\text{spec } B_a \rightarrow \text{spec } A_a$ is surjective (Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 5.10]). Thus we are reduced to showing that the image of a nonempty open subset U of $\text{spec } B_a$ contains a nonempty open subset of $\text{spec } A$. But if U contains $(\text{spec } B_a)_b$, and b satisfies the polynomial $T^m + a_1 T^{m-1} + \cdots + a_m = 0$, $a_i \in A_a$, then $f(U) \supset \bigcup (\text{spec } A_a)_{a_i}$.

Proof of (2.12). (Compare Hartshorne [2, III. Ex. 9.1].) Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be as in the proposition. It suffices to show that $f(Y)$ is open. We may assume that X is quasi-compact. Let $W = X - f(Y)$ and let Z_1, \dots, Z_n be the irreducible components of \overline{W} . Let z_j be the generic point of Z_j . If $z_j \in f(Y)$, say $z_j = f(y)$, then (2.13) applied to $(\overline{\{y\}}, Y)$ shows that there exists an open U in X such that $f(Y) \supset U \cap Z_j \supset \{z_j\}$. But then

$$f(Y) \supset U \cap \left(X - \bigcup_{i \neq j} Z_i \right) \supset \{z_j\},$$

and, as U and $(X - \bigcup_{i \neq j} Z_i)$ are open, this implies that $z_j \notin \overline{W}$, which is a contradiction. Thus $z_j \in W$, and, according to (2.8), all specializations of z_j belong to W . Thus $W \supset Z_j$, $W \supset \bigcup Z_j = \overline{W}$, and $f(Y)$ is open.

Remark 2.14. If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is finite and flat, then it is both open and closed. Thus, if X is connected, then f is surjective and hence faithfully flat (provided $Y \neq \emptyset$).

Exercise 2.15. Give an example to show that (2.12) is false without the finiteness condition, even if f is surjective. (Start with the example in (1.6b)).

If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is finite, and for some $y \in Y$, \mathcal{O}_y is free as an $\mathcal{O}_{f(y)}$ -module, then clearly $\Gamma(f^{-1}(U), \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is free over $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$ for some open affine U in X containing $f(y)$. (See the proof of (b) \Rightarrow (c) in (2.9).) Thus the set of points $y \in Y$ such that \mathcal{O}_y is flat over \mathcal{O}_x is open in Y and is even nonempty if X is integral and $\bar{f}(Y) = X$. Again this holds more generally.

THEOREM 2.16. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be locally of finite-type. The set of points $y \in Y$ such that \mathcal{O}_y is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{f(y)}$ is open in Y ; it is nonempty if X is integral.*

Proof. A reasonably self-contained proof of this may be found in Matsumura [1, Chapter VIII]. See also [EGA, IV.11.1.1].

Recall that, in any category with fiber products, a morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ is a *strict epimorphism* if the sequence

$$Y \times_X Y \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1} \\ \xrightarrow{p_2} \end{array} Y \rightarrow X$$

is exact, that is, if the sequence of sets

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X, Z) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(Y, Z) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{p_1^*} \\ \xrightarrow{p_2^*} \end{array} \mathrm{Hom}(Y \times_X Y, Z)$$

is exact for all Z , that is, if the first arrow maps $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Z)$ bijectively onto the subset of $\mathrm{Hom}(Y, Z)$ on which p_1^* and p_2^* agree.

Clearly the condition that a morphism of schemes be surjective is not sufficient to imply that it is a (strict) epimorphism (consider $\mathrm{spec} k \rightarrow \mathrm{spec} A$, where A is a local Artin ring with residue field k), but for flat morphisms it is (almost).

THEOREM 2.17. *Any faithfully flat morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ of finite-type is a strict epimorphism.*

It is convenient to prove the following result first.

PROPOSITION 2.18. *If $f: A \rightarrow B$ is faithfully flat, then the sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{f} B \xrightarrow{d^0} B^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow B^{\otimes r} \xrightarrow{d^{r-1}} B^{\otimes r+1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

is exact, where

$$\begin{aligned} B^{\otimes r} &= B \otimes_A B \otimes \cdots \otimes_A B && (r \text{ times}) \\ d^{r-1} &= \sum (-1)^i e_i \\ e_i(b_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{r-1}) &= b_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i-1} \otimes 1 \otimes b_i \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The usual argument shows that $d^r d^{r-1} = 0$. We assume first that f admits a section, that is, that there exists a homomorphism $g: B \rightarrow A$ such that $gf = 1$, and we construct a contracting homotopy $k_r: B^{\otimes r+2} \rightarrow B^{\otimes r+1}$. Define

$$k_r(b_0 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{r+1}) = g(b_0)b_1 \otimes b_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{r+1}, \quad r \geq -1.$$

It is easily checked that $k_{r+1}d^{r+1} + d^rk_r = 1$, $r \geq -1$, and this shows that the sequence is exact.

Now let A' be an A -algebra, let $B' = A' \otimes_A B$, and let $f' = 1 \otimes f: A' \rightarrow B'$. The sequence corresponding to f' is obtained from the sequence for f by tensoring with A' (because $B^{\otimes r} \otimes_A A' \approx B'^{\otimes r}$). Thus, if A' is a faithfully flat A -algebra, it suffices to prove the theorem for f' . Take $A' = B$, and then $f' = (b \mapsto b \otimes 1): B \rightarrow B \otimes_A B$ has a section, namely, $g(b \otimes b') = bb'$, and so the sequence is exact.

Remark 2.19. A similar argument to the above shows that if $f: A \rightarrow B$ is faithfully flat and M is an A -module, then the sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M \otimes_A B \xrightarrow{1 \otimes d^0} M \otimes_A B^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow \cdots \\ \rightarrow M \otimes B^{\otimes r} \xrightarrow{1 \otimes d^{r-1}} M \otimes B^{\otimes r+1} \rightarrow \cdots \end{aligned}$$

is exact. Indeed, one may assume again that f has a section and construct a contracting homotopy as before.

Proof of 2.17. We have to show that for any scheme Z and any morphism $h: Y \rightarrow Z$ such that $hp_1 = hp_2$, there exists a unique morphism $g: X \rightarrow Z$ such that $gf = h$.

Case (a) $X = \text{spec } A$, $Y = \text{spec } B$, and $Z = \text{spec } C$ are all affine. In this case the theorem follows from the exactness of

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{e_0 - e_1} B \otimes_A B$$

(since ${}^a e_0 = p_2$, ${}^a e_1 = p_1$).

Case (b) $X = \text{spec } A$ and $Y = \text{spec } B$ affine, Z arbitrary. We first show the uniqueness of g . If $g_1, g_2: X \rightarrow Z$ are such that $g_1 f = g_2 f$, then g_1 and g_2 must agree on the underlying topological space of X because f is surjective. Let $x \in X$; let U be an open affine neighborhood of $g_1(x) (= g_2(x))$ in Z , and let $a \in A$ be such that $x \in X_a$ and $g_1(X_a) = g_2(X_a) \subset U$. Then B_b , where b is the image of a in B is faithfully flat over A_a , and it therefore follows from case (a) that $g_1|_{X_a} = g_2|_{X_a}$.

Now let $h: Y \rightarrow Z$ have $hp_1 = hp_2$. Because of the uniqueness just proved, it suffices to define g locally. Let $x \in X$, $y \in f^{-1}(x)$, and let U be an open affine neighborhood of $h(y)$ in Z . Then $f(h^{-1}(U))$ is open in X (2.12), and so it is possible to find an $a \in A$ such that $x \in X_a \subset f(h^{-1}(U))$. I claim $f^{-1}(X_a)$ is contained in $h^{-1}(U)$. Indeed, if $f(y_1) = f(y_2)$, there

is a $y' \in Y \times Y$ such that $p_1(y') = y_1$ and $p_2(y') = y_2$; if $y_2 \in h^{-1}(U)$, then

$$h(y_1) = hp_1(y') = hp_2(y') = h(y_2) \in U,$$

which proves the claim. If now b is the image of a in B , then $h(Y_b) = h(f^{-1}(X_a)) \subset U$, and B_b is faithfully flat over A_a . Thus the problem is reduced to case (a).

Case (c) General case. It is easy to reduce to the case where X is affine. Since f is quasi-compact, Y is a finite union, $Y = Y_1 \cup \cdots \cup Y_n$, of open affines. Let Y^* be the disjoint union $Y_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup Y_n$. Then Y^* is affine and the obvious map $Y^* \rightarrow X$ is faithfully flat. In the commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{Hom}(X, Z) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Y, Z) & \rightrightarrows & \mathrm{Hom}(Y \times Y, Z) \\ \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Hom}(X, Z) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(Y^*, Z) & \rightrightarrows & \mathrm{Hom}(Y^* \times Y^*, Z), \end{array}$$

the lower row is exact by case (b) and the middle vertical arrow is obviously injective. An easy diagram chase now shows that the top row is exact.

Exercise 2.20. Show that $\mathrm{spec} k[T] \rightarrow \mathrm{spec} k[T^3, T^5]$ is an epimorphism, but is not a strict epimorphism.

Remark 2.21. Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a faithfully flat homomorphism, and let M be an A -module. Write M' for the B -module $f_*M = B \otimes_A M$. The module $e_0 \cdot M' = (B \otimes_A B) \otimes_B M'$ may be identified with $B \otimes_A M'$ where $B \otimes_A B$ acts by $(b_1 \otimes b_2)(b \otimes m) = b_1 b \otimes b_2 m$, and $e_1 \cdot M'$ may be identified with $M' \otimes_A B$ where $B \otimes_A B$ acts by $(b_1 \otimes b_2)(m \otimes b) = b_1 m \otimes b_2 b$. There is a canonical isomorphism $\phi: e_1 \cdot M' \rightarrow e_0 \cdot M'$ arising from

$$e_1 \cdot M' = (e_1 f)_* M = (e_0 f)_* M = e_0 \cdot M';$$

explicitly it is the map

$$M' \otimes_A B \rightarrow B \otimes_A M', \quad (b \otimes m) \otimes b' \mapsto b \otimes (b' \otimes m), \quad m \in M.$$

Moreover, M can be recovered from the pair (M', ϕ) because

$$M = \{m \in M' \mid 1 \otimes m = \phi(m \otimes 1)\}$$

according to (2.19).

Conversely, every pair (M', ϕ) satisfying certain conditions does arise in this way from an A -module. Given $\phi: M' \otimes_A B \rightarrow B \otimes_A M'$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_1: B \otimes_A M' \otimes_A B &\rightarrow B \otimes_A B \otimes_A M', \\ \phi_2: M' \otimes_A B \otimes_A B &\rightarrow B \otimes_A B \otimes_A M', \\ \phi_3: M' \otimes_A B \otimes_A B &\rightarrow B \otimes_A M' \otimes_A B \end{aligned}$$

by tensoring ϕ with id_B in the first, second, and third positions respectively. Then a pair (M', ϕ) arises from an A -module M as above if and only if $\phi_2 = \phi_1\phi_3$. The necessity is easy to check. For the sufficiency, define $M = \{m \in M' \mid 1 \otimes m = \phi(m \otimes 1)\}$. There is a canonical map $(b \otimes m \mapsto bm): B \otimes_A M \rightarrow M'$, and it suffices to show that this is an isomorphism (and that the map arising from M is ϕ). Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M' \otimes_A B & \xrightarrow[\beta \otimes 1]{\alpha \otimes 1} & B \otimes_A M' \otimes_A B \\ \phi \downarrow & & \phi_1 \downarrow \\ B \otimes_A M' & \xrightarrow[e_1 \otimes 1]{e_0 \otimes 1} & B \otimes_A B \otimes_A M' \end{array}$$

in which $\alpha(m) = 1 \otimes m$ and $\beta(m) = \phi(m \otimes 1)$. As the diagram commutes with either the upper or the lower horizontal maps (for the lower maps, this uses the relation $\phi_2 = \phi_1\phi_3$), ϕ induces an isomorphism on the kernels. But, by definition of M , the kernel of the pair $(\alpha \otimes 1, \beta \otimes 1)$ is $M \otimes_A B$, and, according to (2.19), the kernel of the pair $(e_0 \otimes 1, e_1 \otimes 1)$ is M' . This essentially completes the proof.

More details on this, and the following two results may be found in Murre [1, Chapter VII] and Knus-Ojanguren [1, Chapter II].

PROPOSITION 2.22. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be faithfully flat and quasi-compact. To give a quasi-coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module M is the same as to give a quasi-coherent \mathcal{O}_Y -module M' plus an isomorphism $\phi: p_1^*M' \rightarrow p_2^*M'$ satisfying*

$$p_{31}^*(\phi) = p_{32}^*(\phi)p_{21}^*(\phi).$$

(Here the p_{ij} are the various projections $Y \times Y \times Y \rightarrow Y \times Y$, that is $p_{ji}(y_1, y_2, y_3) = (y_j, y_i), j > i$).

Proof. In the case that Y and X are affine, this is a restatement of (2.21).

By using the relation between schemes affine over a scheme and quasi-coherent sheaves of algebras (Hartshorne [2, II. Ex. 5.17]), one can deduce from (2.22) the following result.

THEOREM 2.23. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be faithfully flat and quasi-compact. To give a scheme Z affine over X is the same as to give a scheme Z' affine over Y plus an isomorphism $\phi: p_1^*Z' \rightarrow p_2^*Z'$ satisfying*

$$p_{31}^*(\phi) = p_{32}^*(\phi)p_{21}^*(\phi).$$

Remark 2.24. The above is a sketch of part of descent theory. Another part describes which properties of morphisms descend. Consider a

Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \longleftarrow & Y' \\ \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\ X & \longleftarrow & X' \end{array}$$

in which the map $X' \rightarrow X$ is faithfully flat and quasi-compact. If f' is quasi-compact (respectively separated, of finite-type, proper, an open immersion, affine, finite, quasi-finite, flat, smooth, étale), then f is also [EGA. IV.2.6,2.7]. The reader may check that this statement implies the same statement for faithfully flat morphisms $X' \rightarrow X$ that are locally of finite-type. (Use (2.12)).

Of a similar nature is the result that if $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is faithfully flat and Y is integral (respectively normal, regular), then so also is X [EGA. O_{IV}, 17.3.3].

Finally, we quote a result that may be regarded as a vast generalization of the Hilbert Nullstellensatz. The Nullstellensatz says that any morphism of finite-type $f: X \rightarrow \text{spec } k$, k a field, has a *quasi-section*, that is, that there exists a k -morphism $g: \text{spec } k' \rightarrow X$ with k' a finite field extension of k .

PROPOSITION 2.25. *Let X be quasi-compact, and let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a faithfully flat morphism that is locally of finite-type. Then there exists an affine scheme X' , a faithfully flat quasi-finite morphism $h: X' \rightarrow X$, and an X -morphism $g: X' \rightarrow Y$.*

Proof. One has to show that, locally, there exist sequences satisfying the conditions of (2.6d) and of length equal to the relative dimension of Y/X . (See [EGA. IV.17.16.2] for the details.)

§3. Étale Morphisms

Let k be a field and \bar{k} its algebraic closure. A k -algebra A is *separable* if $\bar{A} = A \otimes_k \bar{k}$ has zero Jacobson radical, that is, if the maximal ideals of \bar{A} have intersection zero.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let A be a finite algebra over a field k . The following are equivalent:*

- (a) A is separable over k ;
- (b) \bar{A} is isomorphic to a finite product of copies of \bar{k} ;
- (c) A is isomorphic to a finite product of separable field extensions of k ;
- (d) the discriminant of any basis of A over k is nonzero (that is, the trace pairing $A \times A \rightarrow k$ is nondegenerate).

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b). From (1.5) we know that \bar{A} has only finitely many prime ideals and that they are all maximal. Now (a) implies that their intersection is zero and (b) follows from the Chinese remainder theorem (Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 1.10]).

(b) \Rightarrow (c). The Chinese remainder theorem implies that A/I_r , where I_r is the Jacobson radical of A , is isomorphic to a finite product $\prod k_i$ of finite field extensions of k . Write $[K:k]_s$ for the separable degree of a field extension K/k . Then $\text{Hom}_{k\text{-alg}}(A, \bar{k})$ has

$$\sum [k_i:k]_s$$

elements. But

$$\text{Hom}_{k\text{-alg}}(A, \bar{k}) \approx \text{Hom}_{\bar{k}\text{-alg}}(\bar{A}, \bar{k}),$$

and this set has $[\bar{A}:\bar{k}]$ elements by (b). Thus

$$[\bar{A}:\bar{k}] = \sum [k_i:k]_s \leq \sum [k_i:k] = [A/I_r:k] \leq [A:k].$$

Since $[\bar{A}:\bar{k}] = [A:k]$, equality must hold throughout and we have (c).

(c) \Rightarrow (d). If $A = \prod k_i$, where the k_i are separable field extensions of k , then $\text{disc}(A) = \prod \text{disc}(k_i)$, and this is nonzero by one of the standard criteria for a field extension to be separable.

(d) \Rightarrow (a). The discriminants of A and \bar{A} are the same. If x is in the radical of \bar{A} , then xa is nilpotent for any $a \in \bar{A}$, and so $\text{Tr}_{\bar{A}/\bar{k}}(xa) = 0$ all a . Thus $x = 0$.

A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ that is locally of finite-type is said to be *unramified* at $y \in Y$ if $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}/\mathfrak{m}_x \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ is a finite separable field extension of $k(x)$, where $x = f(y)$. In terms of rings, this indicates that a homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ of finite-type is unramified at $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{spec } B$ if and only if $\mathfrak{p} = f^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$ generates the maximal ideal in $B_{\mathfrak{q}}$ and $k(\mathfrak{q})$ is a finite separable field extension of $k(\mathfrak{p})$. Thus this terminology agrees with that in number theory.

A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is *unramified* if it is unramified at all $y \in Y$.

PROPOSITION 3.2. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be locally of finite-type. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) *f is unramified;*
- (b) *for all $x \in X$, the fiber $Y_x \rightarrow \text{spec } k(x)$ over x is unramified;*
- (c) *all geometric fibers of f are unramified (that is, for all morphisms $\text{spec } k \rightarrow X$, with k separably closed, $Y \times_X \text{spec } k \rightarrow \text{spec } k$ is unramified);*
- (d) *for all $x \in X$, Y_x has an open covering by spectra of finite separable $k(x)$ -algebras;*
- (e) *for all $x \in X$, Y_x is a sum $\coprod \text{spec } k_i$, where the k_i are finite separable field extensions of $k(x)$;*

(If f is of finite-type, then Y_x itself is the spectrum of a finite separable $k(x)$ -algebra in (d), and Y_x is a finite sum in (e); in particular f is quasi-finite).

Proof. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b). This follows from the isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}/\mathfrak{m}_x\mathcal{O}_{Y,y} \approx \mathcal{O}_{Y_x,y}$.

(b) \Rightarrow (d). Let U be an open affine subset of Y_x , and let \mathfrak{q} be a prime ideal in $B = \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_{Y_x})$. According to (b), $B_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a finite separable field extension of $k(x)$. Also

$$k(x) \subset B/\mathfrak{q} \subset B_{\mathfrak{q}}/\mathfrak{q}B_{\mathfrak{q}} = B_{\mathfrak{q}},$$

and so B/\mathfrak{q} is also a field. Thus \mathfrak{q} is maximal, B is an Artin ring (Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 8.5]), and $B = \prod B_{\mathfrak{q}}$, where \mathfrak{q} runs through the finite set $\text{spec } B$. This proves (d).

A similar argument shows that (c) \Rightarrow (d), and (d) \Rightarrow (e) \Rightarrow (c) and (d) \Rightarrow (b) are trivial consequences of (3.1).

Notice that according to the above definition, any closed immersion $Z \hookrightarrow X$ is unramified. Since this does not agree with our intuitive idea of an unramified covering, for example, of Riemann surfaces, we need a more restricted notion. A morphism of schemes (or rings) is defined to be *étale* if it is flat and unramified (hence also locally of finite-type).

PROPOSITION 3.3. (a) *Any open immersion is étale.*

(b) *The composite of two étale morphisms is étale.*

(c) *Any base change of an étale morphism is étale.*

Proof. After applying (2.4), we only have to check that the three statements hold for unramified morphisms. Both (a) and (b) are obvious (any immersion is unramified). Also, (c) is obviously true according to (3.1) if the base change is of the form $k \rightarrow k'$, where k and k' are fields, but, according to (3.2), this is all that has to be checked.

Example 3.4. Let k be a field and $P(T)$ a monic polynomial over k . Then the monogenic extension $k[T]/(P)$ is separable (or unramified or étale) if and only if P is separable, that is, has no multiple roots in \bar{k} .

This generalizes to rings. A monic polynomial $P(T) \in A[T]$ is separable if $(P, P') = A[T]$, that is, if $P'(T)$ is a unit in $A[T]/(P)$ where $P'(T)$ is the formal derivative of $P(T)$. It is easy to see that P is separable if and only if its image in $k(\mathfrak{p})[T]$ is separable for all prime ideals \mathfrak{p} in A .

Let $B = A[T]/(P)$, where P is any monic polynomial in $A[T]$. As an A -module, B is free of finite rank equal to the degree of P . Moreover, $B \otimes_A k(\mathfrak{p}) = k(\mathfrak{p})[T]/(\bar{P})$ where \bar{P} is the image of P in $k(\mathfrak{p})[T]$. It follows from (3.2b) that B is unramified and so étale over A if and only if P is separable. More generally, for any $b \in B$, B_b is étale over A if and only if P' is a unit in B_b .

For example, $B = A[T]/(T^r - a)$ is étale over A if and only if ra is invertible in A (for $ra \in A^* \Leftrightarrow r\bar{a} \in k(\mathfrak{p})^*$, all $\mathfrak{p} \Leftrightarrow T^r - \bar{a}$ is separable in $k(\mathfrak{p})[T]$ all \mathfrak{p}).

For algebras generated by more than one element, there is the following Jacobian criterion: let $C = A[T_1, \dots, T_n]$, let $P_1, \dots, P_n \in C$, and let $B = C/(P_1, \dots, P_n)$; then B is étale over A if and only if the image of $\det(\partial P_i/\partial T_j)$ in B is a unit. That B is unramified over A if and only if the condition holds follows directly from (3.5b) below. (The B -module $\Omega_{B/A}^1$ has generators dT_1, \dots, dT_n and relations $\sum (\partial P_i/\partial T_j) dT_j = 0$.) That B is flat over A may be proved by repeated applications of (2.5). (See Mumford [3, III, §10. Thm. 3'] for the details.)

Note that if $Y = \text{spec } B$ and $X = \text{spec } A$ were analytic manifolds, then this criterion would indicate that the induced maps on the tangent spaces were all isomorphisms, and hence $Y \rightarrow X$ would be a local isomorphism at every point of Y by the inverse function theorem. It is clearly not true in the geometric case that $\text{spec } B \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ is a local isomorphism (unless local is meant in the sense of the étale topology: see later). For example, consider $\text{spec } \mathbb{Z}[T]/(T^2 - 2) \rightarrow \text{spec } \mathbb{Z}$, which is étale on the complement of $\{(2)\}$.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be locally of finite-type. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) *f is unramified;*
- (b) *the sheaf $\Omega_{Y/X}^1$ is zero;*
- (c) *the diagonal morphism $\Delta_{Y/X}: Y \rightarrow Y \times_X Y$ is an open immersion.*

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b). Since $\Omega_{Y/X}^1$ behaves well with respect to base change, one can reduce the proof to the case that $Y = \text{spec } B$ and $X = \text{spec } A$ are affine, then to the case that $A \rightarrow B$ is a local homomorphism of local rings and using Nakayama's lemma to the case where A and B are fields. Then B is a separable field extension of A , and it is a standard fact that this implies that $\Omega_{B/A}^1 = 0$.

(b) \Rightarrow (c). Since the diagonal is always at least locally closed, we may choose an open subscheme U of $Y \times_X Y$ such that $\Delta_{Y/X}: Y \rightarrow U$ is a closed immersion and regard Y as a subscheme of U . Let I be the sheaf of ideals on U defining Y . Then I/I^2 , regarded as a sheaf on Y , is isomorphic to $\Omega_{Y/X}^1$ and hence is zero. Using Nakayama's lemma, one sees this implies that $I_y = 0$ for all $y \in Y$, and it follows that $I = 0$ on some open subset V of U containing Y . Then $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y) = (V, \mathcal{O}_V)$ is an open subscheme of $Y \times_X Y$.

(c) \Rightarrow (a). By passing to the geometric fiber over a point of X , we may reduce the problem to the case of a morphism $f: Y \rightarrow \text{spec } k$ where k

is an algebraically closed field. Let y be a closed point of Y . Because k is algebraically closed, there exists a section $g: \text{spec } k \rightarrow Y$ whose image is $\{y\}$. The following square is Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{\Delta} & Y \times_X Y \\ \uparrow g & & \uparrow (gf, 1) \\ \{y\} & \xrightarrow{g} & Y. \end{array}$$

Since Δ is an open immersion, this implies that $\{y\}$ is open in Y . Moreover, $\text{spec } \mathcal{O}_y = \{y\} \rightarrow \text{spec } k$ still has the property that $\text{spec } \mathcal{O}_y \xrightarrow{\Delta} \text{spec } (\mathcal{O}_y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_y)$ is an open immersion. But \mathcal{O}_y is a local Artin ring with residue field k , and so $\text{spec } \mathcal{O}_y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_y$ has only one point, and $\mathcal{O}_y \otimes_k \mathcal{O}_y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_y$ must be an isomorphism. By counting dimensions over k , one sees then that $\mathcal{O}_y = k$. Thus, by applying (3.1) and (3.2), we have (a).

COROLLARY 3.6. *Consider morphisms $f: X \rightarrow S$, $g: Y \rightarrow X$. If fg is étale and f is unramified, then g is étale.*

Proof. Write $g = p_2 \Gamma_g$ where $\Gamma_g: Y \rightarrow Y \times_S X$ is the graph of g and $p_2: Y \times_S X \rightarrow X$ is the projection on the second factor. Γ_g is the pull-back of the open immersion $\Delta_{X/S}: X \rightarrow X \times_S X$ by $g \times 1: Y \times_S X \rightarrow X \times_S X$, and p_2 is the pull-back of the étale map $fg: Y \rightarrow S$ by $f: X \rightarrow S$. Thus, by using (3.3), we see that g is étale.

Remark 3.7. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be locally of finite-type. The annihilator of $\Omega_{Y/X}^1$ (an ideal in \mathcal{O}_Y) is called the *different* $\mathfrak{d}_{Y/X}$ of Y over X . That this definition agrees with the one in number theory is proved in Serre [7, III.7].

The closed subscheme of Y defined by $\mathfrak{d}_{Y/X}$ is called the *branch locus* of Y over X . The open complement of the branch locus is precisely the set on which $\Omega_{Y/X}^1 = 0$, that is, on which $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is unramified. The theorem of the purity of branch locus states that the branch locus (if nonempty) has pure codimension one in Y in each of the two cases: (a) when f is faithfully flat and finite over X ; or (b) when f is quasi-finite and dominating, Y is regular and X is normal. (See Altman and Kleiman [1, VI.6.8], [SGA. 1, X.3.1], and [SGA. 2, X.3.4].)

PROPOSITION 3.8. *If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is locally of finite-type, then the set of points y of Y , such that $\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)}$ and $\Omega_{Y/X,y}^1 = 0$, is open in Y . Thus there is a unique largest open set U in Y on which f is étale.*

Proof. This follows immediately from (2.16).

Exercise 3.9. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be finite and flat, and assume that X is connected. Then $f_* \mathcal{O}_Y$ is locally free, of constant rank r say. Show that there is a sheaf of ideals $\mathfrak{D}_{Y/X}$ on X , called the *discriminant* of Y over

X , with the property that if U is an open affine in X such that $B = \Gamma(f^{-1}(U), \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is free with basis $\{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$ over $A = \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$, then $\Gamma(U, \mathfrak{D}_{Y/X})$ is the principal ideal generated by $\det(\text{Tr}_{B/A}(b_i b_j))$. Show that f is unramified, hence étale, at all $y \in f^{-1}(x)$ if and only if $(\mathfrak{D}_{Y/X})_x = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ (use (3.1d)). Use this to show that if f is unramified at all $y \in f^{-1}(x)$ for some $x \in X$, then there exists an open subset $U \subset X$ containing x such that $f: f^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is étale. Show that if $B = A[T]/(P(T))$ with P monic, then the discriminant $\mathfrak{D}_{B/A} = (D(P))$, where $D(P)$ is the discriminant of P , that is, the resultant, $\text{res}(P, P')$, of P and P' . Show also that the different $\mathfrak{d}_{B/A} = (P'(t))$ where $t = T \pmod{P}$. (See Serre [7, III.§6].)

The next proposition and its corollaries show that étale morphisms have the uniqueness properties of local isomorphisms.

PROPOSITION 3.10. *Any closed immersion $f: Y \rightarrow X$ that is flat (hence étale) is an open immersion.*

Proof. According to (2.12), $f(Y)$ is open in X and so, after replacing X by $f(Y)$, we may assume f to be surjective. As f is finite, $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ is locally free as an \mathcal{O}_X -module (2.9). Since f is a closed immersion, this implies that $\mathcal{O}_X \approx f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$, that is, that f is an isomorphism.

Remark 3.11. By using Zariski's main theorem, we may prove a stronger result, namely, that any étale, universally injective, separated morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is an open immersion. (*Universally injective* is equivalent to *injective and all maps $k(f(y)) \rightarrow k(y)$ radical* [EGA. I.3.7.1].) In fact, by proceeding as above, one can assume that f is universally bijective, hence a homeomorphism (2.12), hence proper, and hence finite (1.10). Now f being étale and radical implies that $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ must be free of rank one.

COROLLARY 3.12. *If X is connected and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is étale (respectively étale and separated), then any section s of f is an open immersion (respectively an isomorphism onto an open connected component). Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of such sections and the set of those open (respectively open and closed) subschemes Y_i of Y such that f induces an isomorphism $Y_i \rightarrow X$. In particular, a section is known when its value at one point is known if f is separated.*

Proof. Only the first assertion requires proof. Assume first that f is separated. Then s is a closed immersion because $fs = 1$ is a closed immersion, and f is separated (compare with the proof of (3.6)). According to (3.6) s is étale, and hence it is an open immersion. Thus s is an isomorphism onto its image, which is both open and closed in Y . If f is only assumed to be étale, then it is separated in a neighborhood of y and $x = f(y)$, and hence the above argument shows that s is a local isomorphism at x .

COROLLARY 3.13. *Let $f, g: Y' \rightarrow Y$ be X -morphisms where Y' is a connected X -scheme and Y is étale and separated over X . If there exists a point $y' \in Y'$ such that $f(y') = g(y') = y$ and the maps $k(y) \rightarrow k(y')$ induced by f and g coincide, then $f = g$.*

Proof. The graphs of f and g , $\Gamma_f, \Gamma_g: Y' \rightarrow Y' \times_X Y$, are sections to $p_1: Y' \times_X Y \rightarrow Y'$. The conditions imply that Γ_f and Γ_g agree at a point, and so Γ_f and Γ_g are equal (3.12). Thus $f = p_2\Gamma_f = p_2\Gamma_g = g$.

We saw in (3.4) above that given a monic polynomial $P(T)$ over A , it is possible to construct an étale morphism $\text{spec } C \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ by taking $C = B_b$ where $B = A[T]/(P)$ and b is such that $P'(T)$ is a unit in B_b . We shall call such an étale morphism *standard*. The interesting fact is that locally every étale morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ is standard. Geometrically this means that in a neighborhood of any point x of X , there are functions a_1, \dots, a_r such that Y is locally described by the equation $T^r + a_1T^{r-1} + \dots + a_r = 0$, and the roots of the equation are all simple (at any geometric point).

THEOREM 3.14. *Assume that $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is étale in some open neighborhood of $y \in Y$. Then there are open affine neighborhoods V and U of y and $f(y)$, respectively, such that $f|_V: V \rightarrow U$ is a standard étale morphism.*

Proof. Clearly, we may assume that $Y = \text{spec } C$ and $X = \text{spec } A$ are affine. Also, by Zariski's main theorem (1.8), we may assume that C is a finite A -algebra. Let \mathfrak{q} be the prime ideal of C corresponding to y . We have to show that there is a standard étale A -algebra B_b such that $B_b \approx C_c$ for some $c \notin \mathfrak{q}$. It is easy to see (because everything is finite over A) that it suffices to do this with A replaced by $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$, where $\mathfrak{p} = f^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$, that is, that we may assume that A is local and that \mathfrak{q} lies over the maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of A .

Choose an element $t \in C$ whose image \bar{t} in $C/\mathfrak{p}C$ generates $k(\mathfrak{q})$ over $k(\mathfrak{p})$, that is, \bar{t} is such that $k(\mathfrak{p})[\bar{t}] = k(\mathfrak{q}) \subset C/\mathfrak{p}C$. Such an element exists because $C/\mathfrak{p}C$ is a product $k(\mathfrak{q}) \times C'$, and $k(\mathfrak{q})/k(\mathfrak{p})$ is separable. Let $\mathfrak{q}' = \mathfrak{q} \cap A[t]$. I claim that $A[t]_{\mathfrak{q}'} \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is an isomorphism. Note first that \mathfrak{q} is the only prime ideal of C lying over \mathfrak{q}' (in checking this, one may tensor with $k(\mathfrak{p})$). Thus the semilocal ring $C \otimes_{A[t]} A[t]_{\mathfrak{q}'}$ is actually local and so equals $C_{\mathfrak{q}}$. As $A[t] \rightarrow C$ is injective and finite, it follows that

$$A[t]_{\mathfrak{q}'} \rightarrow C \otimes_{A[t]} A[t]_{\mathfrak{q}'} = C_{\mathfrak{q}}$$

is injective and finite. It is surjective because $k(\mathfrak{q}') \rightarrow k(\mathfrak{q})$ is surjective, and Nakayama's lemma may be applied.

$A[t]$ is finite over A (it is a submodule of a Noetherian A -module), and the isomorphism $A[t]_{\mathfrak{q}'} \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{q}}$ extends to an isomorphism $A[t]_{c'} \xrightarrow{\approx} C_c$ for some $c \notin \mathfrak{q}$, $c' \notin \mathfrak{q}'$. Thus C may be replaced by $A[t]$, that is, we may assume that t generates C over A .

Let $n = [k(\mathfrak{q}):k(\mathfrak{p})]$, so that $1, \bar{t}, \dots, \bar{t}^{n-1}$ generate $k(\mathfrak{q})$ as a vector space over $k(\mathfrak{p})$. Then $1, t, \dots, t^{n-1}$ generate $C = A[t]$ over A (according to Nakayama's lemma), and so there is a monic polynomial $P(T)$ of degree n and a surjection $h: B = A[T]/(P) \rightarrow C$. Clearly $\bar{P}(T)$ is the characteristic polynomial of \bar{t} in $k(\mathfrak{q})$ over $k(\mathfrak{p})$ and so is separable. Thus B_b is a standard étale A -algebra for some $b \notin h^{-1}(\mathfrak{q})$. With a suitable choice of b and c we get a surjection $h': B_b \rightarrow C_c$ with both B_b and C_c étale A -algebras. According to (3.6), h' is étale, and ${}^a h': \text{spec } C_c \rightarrow \text{spec } B_b$ is a closed immersion. Hence, according to (3.10), ${}^a h'$ is an open immersion, which completes the proof.

Remark 3.15. The fact that f was flat was used only in the last step of the above proof. Thus the argument shows that locally every unramified morphism is a composite of a closed immersion with a standard étale morphism.

COROLLARY 3.16. *A morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is étale if and only if for every $y \in Y$, there exist open affine neighborhoods $V = \text{spec } C$ of y and $U = \text{spec } A$ of $x = f(y)$ such that*

$$C = A[T_1, \dots, T_n]/(P_1, \dots, P_n)$$

and $\det(\partial P_i / \partial T_j)$ is a unit in C .

Proof. Because of (3.4), we only have to prove the necessity. From the theorem, we may assume that $Y \rightarrow X$ is standard étale, for example $X = \text{spec } A$, $Y = \text{spec } C$, $C = B_b$, $B = A[T]/(P)$. Then $C \approx A[T, U]/(P(T), bU - 1)$, and the determinant corresponding to this is $P'(T)b$. Since the image of $P'(T)b$ is a unit in C , this proves the corollary with the added information that n may be taken to be two.

With this structure theorem, it is relatively easy to prove that if $Y \rightarrow X$ is étale, then Y inherits many of the good properties of X . (For the opposite inheritance, see (2.24).)

PROPOSITION 3.17. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be étale.*

- (a) $\dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}) = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)})$ for all $y \in Y$.
- (b) If X is normal, then Y is normal.
- (c) If X is regular, then Y is regular.

Proof. (a) We may assume that $X = \text{spec } A$ where $A (= \mathcal{O}_x)$ is local and that $Y = \text{spec } B$. The proof uses only the assumption that B is quasi-finite and flat over A . Let \mathfrak{q} be the prime ideal of B corresponding to y (so \mathfrak{q} lies over \mathfrak{p} , the maximal ideal of A). Then $\text{spec } B_{\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ is surjective (2.7), so $\dim(B_{\mathfrak{q}}) \geq \dim(A)$. Conversely we may assume $B = B'_b$, where B' is finite over A (1.8). Then $\dim(A) \geq \dim(B') (\geq \dim B_{\mathfrak{q}})$ (Atiyah-Macdonald [1, 5.9]).

(b) We may assume that $X = \text{spec } A$ where A is local (hence normal) and that $T = \text{spec } C$ where $C = B_b$ is a standard étale A -algebra with

$B = A[T]/(P(T))$. Let K be the field of fractions of A , let $L = C \otimes_A K = K[T]/(P(T))$, and let A' be the integral closure of A in L . Note that L is a product of separable field extensions of K . Then we have the inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C & \subset & A'_b \subset L \\ \cup & & \cup \\ A & \subset & B \subset A' \end{array}$$

Write $t = T \pmod{P(T)}$. Choose an $a \in A'$. We have to show that a/b^5 , or equivalently just a , is in C .

Let \bar{K} be the algebraic closure of K and ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r the homomorphisms $L \rightarrow \bar{K}$ over K such that $\phi_1(t), \dots, \phi_r(t)$ are the roots of $P(T)$ (so $r = \text{degree } P$). Write

$$a = a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_{r-1} t^{r-1}, \quad a_i \in K.$$

Then we have r equations,

$$\phi_j(a) = a_0 + a_1 t_j + \dots + a_{r-1} t_j^{r-1}$$

where $t_j = \phi_j(t)$. Let D be the determinant of these equations, regarding the a_i as unknowns, so that $D = \pm \prod_{i < j} (t_i - t_j)$, that is, $D^2 = \text{discriminant of } P(T) = \mathfrak{D}_{B/A}$ (compare (3.9)). Since the $\phi_j(a)$ and t_j^i are integral over A , it follows from Cramer's rule that the Da_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, are also integral over A . Since the $Da_i \in K$ and A is normal, they belong to A , and this implies that $Da \in B \subset C$. Since D is a unit in C , it follows that $a \in C$.

(c) Let $y \in Y$. Then $\dim(\mathcal{O}_{Y,y}) = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)})$, and $m_y = m_x \mathcal{O}_{Y,y}$ can be generated by $\dim(\mathcal{O}_{X,f(y)})$ elements.

Remark 3.18. An argument, similar to that in (b), shows that if X is reduced, then Y is reduced (Raynaud [3, p. 74]).

We now determine the structure of étale morphisms $Y \rightarrow X$ when X is normal.

PROPOSITION 3.19. *Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be étale, where X is normal. Then locally f is a standard étale morphism of the form $\text{spec } C \rightarrow \text{spec } A$ where A is an integral domain, $C = B_b$, $B = A[T]/(P(T))$, and $P(T)$ is irreducible over the field of fractions of A .*

Proof. The only new fact to be shown is that $P(T)$ may be chosen to be irreducible over the field of fractions K of A . Clearly we may reduce the problem to the case that $X = \text{spec } A$ where A is a local ring and assume that $Y = \text{spec } C$ with C a standard étale A -algebra, say $C = B_b$, $B = A[T]/(P(T))$ with $P(T)$ possibly reducible. Fix a prime ideal \mathfrak{q} in C such that $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q} \cap A$ is the maximal ideal of A .

Note that any monic factor $Q(T)$ of $P(T)$ in $K[T]$ automatically has coefficients in A . (Let K' be a splitting field for $Q(T)$; the roots of $Q(T)$ in K' are also roots of $P(T)$ and hence are integral over A ; it follows that the coefficients of $Q(T)$ are also integral over A since they can be expressed in terms of the roots.) Choose $P_1(T)$ to be a monic irreducible factor of $P(T)$ whose image in $k(\mathfrak{q})$ is zero, and write $P(T) = P_1(T)Q(T)$ with $P_1, Q \in A[T]$. Then the images \bar{P}_1 and \bar{Q} of P_1 and Q in $k(\mathfrak{p})[T]$ are coprime since $\bar{P}(T)$ is separable and so has no multiple roots. It follows that $(P_1, Q) = A[T]$ (compare (4.1a) below), and the Chinese remainder theorem shows that $B \approx A[T]/(P_1) \times A[T]/(Q)$. Let b_1 be the image of b in $B_1 = A[T]/(P_1)$. Obviously $C_1 = (B_1)_{b_1}$ is the standard A -algebra sought.

THEOREM 3.20. *Let X be a normal scheme and $f: Y \rightarrow X$ an unramified morphism. Then f is étale if and only if, for any $y \in Y$, $\mathcal{O}_{X, f(y)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$ is injective.*

Proof. If f is flat, then $\mathcal{O}_{f(y)} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_y$ is injective according to (2.3). For the converse, note that locally f factors into $Y \xrightarrow{f'} Y' \xrightarrow{g} X$ with f' a closed immersion and g étale (3.15). Write $A = \mathcal{O}_{X, f(y)}$; following (3.19), we may write $\mathcal{O}_{Y', f'(y)} = C_{\mathfrak{q}}$ where $C = A[T]/(P(T))$ with $P(T)$ irreducible over the field of fractions K of A . We have $A \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$, which, when tensored with K , becomes $K \rightarrow C_{\mathfrak{q}} \otimes_A K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y} \otimes_A K$. As $A \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$ is injective, $K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y} \otimes_A K$ is injective, which shows that $C_{\mathfrak{q}} \otimes_A K \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y} \otimes_A K$ is not the zero map. But $C_{\mathfrak{q}} \otimes_A K = K[T]/(P)$ is a field, and so this last map is injective. Hence $C_{\mathfrak{q}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$ is injective, and we already know that it is surjective because f' is a closed immersion. Thus $\mathcal{O}_{Y, y} = C_{\mathfrak{q}}$ is flat over A .

THEOREM 3.21. *Let X be a connected normal scheme, and let $K = R(X)$. Let L be a finite separable field extension of K , let X' be the normalization of X in L , and let U be any open subscheme of X' that is disjoint from the support of $\Omega_{X'/X}^1$. Then $U \rightarrow X$ is étale, and conversely any separated étale morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ of finite-type can be written $Y = \coprod U_i \rightarrow X$ where each $U_i \rightarrow X$ is of this form.*

Proof. $\Omega_{U/X}^1 = \Omega_{X'/X}^1|_U = 0$, and so $U \rightarrow X$ is unramified according to (3.5). It is étale according to (3.20).

Conversely, let $Y \rightarrow X$ be separated, étale, and of finite-type. The connected components Y_i of Y are irreducible (because the irreducible components of Y containing y are in one-to-one correspondence with the minimal prime ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{Y, y}$ and Y is normal). If $\text{spec } L_i \rightarrow \text{spec } K$ is the generic fiber of $Y_i \rightarrow X$ and X_i is the normalization of X in L_i , then Zariski's main theorem implies that $Y_i \rightarrow X_i$ is an open immersion (see (1.8), especially the proof).

Remark 3.22. In [EGA. IV.17] the following functorial definitions are made. Let X be a scheme and F a contravariant functor $\mathbf{Sch}/X \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$. Then F is said to be *formally smooth (lisse)* (respectively, *formally unramified (net)*, *formally étale*) if for any affine X -scheme X' and any subscheme X'_0 of X' defined by a nilpotent ideal \mathfrak{I} , $F(X') \rightarrow F(X'_0)$ is surjective (respectively, injective, bijective).

A scheme Y over X is said to be *formally smooth*, *formally unramified*, or *formally étale* over X when the functor $h_Y = \text{Hom}_X(-, Y)$ it defines has the corresponding property. If, in addition, Y is locally of finite presentation over X , then one says simply that Y is smooth, unramified, or étale over X .

We show that a morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ that is étale in our sense is also étale in the above sense. (The converse, which is more difficult, may be found, for example, in Artin [9, I.1.1].) Thus, given an X -morphism $g_0: X'_0 \rightarrow Y$, we must show that there is a unique X -morphism $g: X' \rightarrow Y$ lifting it:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 Y & \xleftarrow{g_0} & X'_0 \\
 f \downarrow & \swarrow g & \downarrow \\
 X & \longleftarrow & X'
 \end{array}$$

The uniqueness implies that it suffices to do this locally. Thus we may assume that f is standard, for example, $X = \text{spec } A$, $Y = \text{spec } C$, $C = B_b$, $B = A[T]/(P) = A[t]$. Let $X' = \text{spec } R$, $X'_0 = \text{spec } R_0$ and $R_0 = R/\mathfrak{I}$. Then we are given an A -homomorphism $g_0: C \rightarrow R_0$, and we want to find a unique $g: C \rightarrow R$ lifting it:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C & \xrightarrow{g_0} & R_0 = R/\mathfrak{I} \\
 \uparrow & \swarrow g & \uparrow \\
 A & \longrightarrow & R
 \end{array}$$

By using induction on the length of \mathfrak{I} , we may reduce the question to the case that $\mathfrak{I}^2 = 0$. Let $r \in R$ be such that $g_0(t) = r \pmod{\mathfrak{I}}$. We have to find an $r' \in R$ such that $r' \equiv r \pmod{\mathfrak{I}}$ and $P(r') = 0$. Write $r' = r + h$, $h \in \mathfrak{I}$. Then h must satisfy the equation $P(r + h) = 0$. But $P(r + h) = P(r) + hP'(r)$, where $P(r) \in \mathfrak{I}$ and $P'(r)$ is a unit (since $P'(t) \in C^* \Rightarrow P'(r) \in R_0^*$), and so there is a unique h .

Alternatively, this may be proved by applying (3.12) to $Y \times_X X'/X'$.

THEOREM 3.23. (Topological invariance of étale morphisms.) Let X_0 be the closed subscheme of a scheme X defined by a nilpotent ideal. The functor $Y \mapsto Y_0 = Y \times_X X_0$ gives an equivalence between the categories of étale X -schemes and étale X_0 -schemes.

(continued...)

Index

- AB3 . . . 5*, 306
 action of sheaf, 120
 acyclic morphism, 232
 acyclic object, 83, 86
 affine morphism, 4
 algebra; Azumaya, 136–54; central
 separable, 141; central simple, 137;
 maximal étale sub-, 139; opposite, 136
 algebraic space, 116, 122, 157–59
 arithmetic genus, 217
 Artin character, 186–87
 Artin neighborhood, 117
 Artin-Schreier sequence, 67
 Artin-Schreier theory, 127–28
 associated sheaf, 57, 60–62; stalk of, 63
 Azumaya algebra, *see* algebra, Azumaya
- Bertini's theorem, 209
 Betti numbers, 166, 205
 bilinear, 79
 branch locus, 24; purity of, 24
 Brauer group, 136–54; cohomological,
 136, 147; of Henselian ring, 138, 148;
 of local ring, 136–40; of regular
 scheme, 149; of scheme, 140–54;
 of smooth variety, 149
 Brauer-Severi schemes, 134–35
- Cartesian, 144
 Cartier divisor, 73
 Cartier dual, 130
 Cartier operator, 129
 Castelnuovo's criterion, 217–19
 Cayley-Hamilton polynomial, 139
 Char(X), 230
 Chern class, 204; étale, 271–76; total, 273
 Chern polynomial, 273
 Chern roots, 274
 Chow ring CH(X), 274
 cofiltered category, 305
- cofinal, 306
 cohomological dimension, 220–22, 246,
 253–56, 283; of curves, 183–84
 cohomology, 84; Amitsur, 97; of
 blowing-up, 203, 229–30, 247; Čech,
 95–105; Čech and derived, 99, 100, 103,
 104–105; with compact support, 93–94,
 229–30; of complete intersection, 246;
 complex and étale, 117–19, 164, 229, 241;
 of curves, 175–97; of direct limits, 113;
 étale and flat, 114–17; finiteness of,
 222–27, 232, 244, 246; flat and Zariski,
 113–14; of \mathbb{G}_m , 106–110; invariance,
 224, 231; and inverse limits, 88–89, 119;
 nonabelian, 122; and Picard scheme,
 130–33; of \mathbb{P}^m , 245–46, 270; of smooth
 group schemes, 114–17; with support
 on Z , 91–94; of surfaces, 197–219
 complex, bounded, 310; double, 309;
 perfect, 263; total, 309;
 conductor, 188
 connected category, 305
 constructible function, 161
 cospecialization map, 77, 162, 230
 covering, E-, 47; geometric, 126;
 infinitesimal, 128–29; of Picard type,
 126; refinement of, 95
 cycle, algebraic, 268 prime, 268
 cycle map, 268–71, 275–76
- derived functor, 82, 310–12
 descent theory, 16–20, 158
 different, 24, 25
 direct image, higher, 85, 88; higher with
 compact support, 227–30; of presheaf,
 56–9; of sheaf, 68–77
 discriminant, 20, 24
- elementary fibration, 117
 étale closure, 44

- étale morphism, 3, 22–35; of algebraic spaces, 157; to normal scheme, 29; standard, 26, 28; topological invariance of, 30
- étale neighborhood, 36, 38
- Euler-Poincaré characteristic, 166, 190–95, 202, 204–205
- exact, 16, 122
- excellent scheme, 4
- excision, 92
- extension by zero, 76, 78, 81
- faithfully flat morphism, 10–20; is strict epimorphism, 16
- fibered category, 144
- finite morphism, 4–7
- filtered category, 305
- flat morphism, 3, 7–20, 31; is open, 14
- formally étale, 30
- formally smooth, 30
- formally unramified, 30
- Frobenius elements, arithmetic, 292; geometric, 292
- Frobenius endomorphism, 109, 185
- fundamental class, 247–52
- fundamental group, 39–45; of curve, 42–43, 194; tame, 42, 193–5, 208; true, 45
- Galois covering, 40, 43–44, 49, 99
- generators, family of, 83
- generically locally constant, 77
- gerbe, 144
- Grothendieck resolution, 90, 171
- group scheme, 52; Cartier dual, 130
- Gysin map, 244, 250, 253, 283–84
- Gysin sequence, 243–44, 250–52
- hard Lefschetz theorem, 207
- Hasse-Witt matrix, 128
- Hensel's lemma, 32, 35
- Henselian ring, 3, 32–39, 41, 239–40
- Henselization, 36
- Hilbert's theorem 90, 124
- homotopic, 167, 257
- hypercohomology, 310–12
- injective, 82
- internal Hom, 79
- inverse image, in fibered category, 144; preserves injectives, 87; of presheaf, 56–59; of sheaf, 68–76; twisted, 285
- Jacobian criterion, 23
- Jacobson scheme, 65, 90
- Každán-Margulis theorem, 211
- Kummer covering, 41, 42
- Kummer sequence, 66
- Kummer theory, 125–27
- Künneth formula, 256–68, 271–72
- L, 197
- Lefschetz pencils, 197–99
- Lefschetz theorems, 207
- Lefschetz theory, local, 199–207; global, 207–214
- Lefschetz trace formula, 287–88, 292, 295, 298; for curves, 185, 195, 205
- limits, 304–306
- lisse, 164
- L-series, 195–97, 289–303; Artin, 293, 195–97
- map of degree r , 167
- mapping cone, 174
- Mayer-Vietoris sequence, 110
- Milnor number, 193
- monodromy, 207–211
- Mordell-Weil theorem, 133
- morphism, acyclic, 232–41; base change, 223; compactifiable, 227, 229; continuous, 56; Frobenius, 290–91; locally acyclic, 232–41; of presheaves, 48; of sheaves, 50; of sites, 56; of smooth S -pairs, 241; universally acyclic, 232–41; universally injective, 25
- Néron minimal model, 192–93
- Néron-Severi group, 131–32, 284; finite generation of, 215–16
- normalization, 4
- numerical equivalence, 215, 284
- Ogg-Šafarevic-Grothendieck formula, 190–95
- Ogg-Tate formula, 193
- Order, 150

- Pairing, canonical of Exts, 167; cup product, 171–74
perfect complex, 263
Picard-Lefschetz formula, 206–207
Picard scheme, 130–33
plurigenus, 217
Poincaré duality, 276–86; curves, 175–85; local, 181–82
presheaf, 47; basically bounded, 57; category of, 48; constant, 48; free, 79; section of, 47; separated, 49;
principal homogeneous space, 120–33
projection formula, cycles, 268; sheaves, 250
proper base change theorem, 72, 89, 222–27, 260
pseudofiltered, 304–305
purity, of Azumaya algebras, 153; of branch locus, 24; cohomological, 241–47
quasi-finite morphism, 4–7
quasi-isomorphism, 310
quasi-section, 20
Riemann existence theorem, 40, 118
Riemann hypothesis, 286
S, S_1 , S_2 , 49
separable, algebra, 20; polynomial, 22
sheaf, 49; category of, 63; constant, 65, 156; constructible, 155–56, 160–64; étale over field, 53; étale over discrete valuation ring, 75; finite, 155–56; with finite stalks, 155–56; flabby, 87–89, 91, 101–103, 113; flasque, 87; free, 79; generically locally constant, 77; induced, 90; l -adic, 163; locally constant, 155, 156, 162; l -torsion, 220; locally constructible, 160–64, 225; locally free, 163–64; pseudo-coherent, 80, 95; of \mathbb{Q}_l -vector spaces, 164; represented by algebraic space, 159; Tate twist of, 163; torsion, 220; twisted-constant, 65, 155, 164; of \mathbb{Z}_l -modules, 163
sieve, 55
similar, 137, 141
site, 47, 112–13
Skolem-Noether theorem, 138, 141
smooth base change theorem, 230–41
smooth morphism, 30, 31, 39
smooth S-pair, 241
smooth specialization, 230
spectral sequence, 307–309; Čech to derived, 100–101; for closed subschemes, 94; with closed support, 241; Hochschild-Serre, 105; Leray, 89, 228; local-global for Exts, 91
splits, 139
stack, 144
stalk, 60, 63–65, 80; of direct image, 70, 71; of higher direct image, 88; of inverse image, 69
Stein factorization, 72
strict epimorphism, 16
strict Henselization, 38
strictly coprime, 32
strictly Henselian (local), 3, 38, 41
support of sheaf, 75
Swan character, 188
tamely ramified, 41–42
tensor product, of complexes, 257; of sheaves, 79
topology, 47, 54; comparison of, 110–19
tor-dimension, 263
torsor, 120–33
trace map, 168–71, 276, 284; noncommutative, 301
twisted forms, 134
universally injective morphism, 25
unramified morphism, 21–32, 36
vanishing cycle, 200; canonical, 205; conjugacy of, 208; space of, 207
weak Lefschetz theorem, 253–56
Weierstrass minimal equation, 193
Weil conjectures, 286
Weil divisor, 73
Zariski's main theorem, 6
Zeta function, 286–303; of curves, 185–86