# PICARD-V: SCHEMES ARE SHEAVES 
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## 1. The Yoneda Embedding

1.1. Schemes over $S$ as functors. For any category $\mathscr{C}$, let $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ be the category of contravariant (Sets)-valued functors on $\mathscr{C}$. Recall that this means that an object $F$ of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ is a functor

$$
F: \mathscr{C}^{\circ} \rightarrow(\text { Sets })
$$

and given two such functors $F$ and $G$, a morphism from $F$ to $G$ is a natural transformation (or, what is the same thing, a functorial map)

$$
F \rightarrow G
$$

For the rest of these notes, fix a scheme $S$, and set $\mathscr{C}:=\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$. Let $X$ be scheme over $S$. Define the "functor of points" on $X$ to be the functor on $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$

$$
h_{X}:\left(\operatorname{Sch}_{/ S}\right)^{\circ} \rightarrow(\text { Sets })
$$

given by

$$
T \mapsto \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h} / S}(T, X) \quad\left(T \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}\right)
$$

with an obvious effect on morphisms $\varphi: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, namely,

$$
q \mapsto q \circ \varphi
$$

for $\left.q \in h_{X}(T)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}}^{/ S}(T, X)\right)$. Note that $h_{X} \in \widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ for every $X \in \mathbb{S c h} / S$.
Next, if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ then

$$
f \circ(\cdot): \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}}(T, X) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}}(T, Y)
$$

defined by composing (on the left) with $f$, is functorial in $T$. Hence we get a map in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$

$$
h_{f}: h_{X} \rightarrow h_{Y} .
$$

It is trivial to check that for a pair of maps in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$

$$
X \xrightarrow{f} Y \xrightarrow{g} Z,
$$

the diagram

commutes. In other words the association

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{(\cdot)}: \operatorname{Sch}_{/ S} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathscr{C}} \tag{1.1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

defines a functor.
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The process $f \mapsto h_{f}$ (for $f: X \rightarrow Y$ a map of $S$-schemes) can be "reversed". More precisely, given a map $\psi: h_{X} \rightarrow h_{Y}$ in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}\left(X\right.$ and $Y$ in $\left.\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}\right)$, we can find a unique map $f=f_{\psi}: X \rightarrow Y$ such that $\psi=h_{f}$. Indeed, we have a map of sets $\psi(X): h_{X}(X) \rightarrow h(Y)$, and hence we have an element $f_{\psi} \in h_{X}(Y)=$ $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}}(X, Y)$ defined by the image of $\mathbf{1}_{X} \in h_{X}(X)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}}(X, X)$ under $\psi(X)$. It is easy to see that $h_{f_{\psi}}=\psi$. It is equally easy to see - from the definitionsthat if $f: X \rightarrow Y$ is a map in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ and $\psi: h_{X} \rightarrow h_{Y}$ is defined by $\psi=h_{f}$, then $f_{\psi}=f$ (i.e., $f_{h_{f}}=f$ ). Thus $f \mapsto h_{f}$ and $\psi \mapsto f_{\psi}$ are inverse processes. This can be restated in the following compact form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{X}(T)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}}^{/ S}(T, X) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hom}_{\hat{\mathscr{G}}}\left(h_{T}, h_{X}\right) . \tag{1.1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Another way of saying this is that $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ can be regarded as a full subcategory of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ via the functor $h_{(\cdot)}$ (see Theorem 1.1.4 below).

The isomorphism in (1.1.2) can be extended-as we will see below-to give an isomorphism of sets:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(T) \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{Hom}_{\overparen{\mathscr{C}}}\left(h_{T}, F\right) \tag{1.1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, given $\xi \in F(T)$, and $W \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, we can define $\theta_{\xi}(W): h_{T}(W) \rightarrow F(W)$ as follows: Let $f: W \rightarrow T$ be an element of $h_{T}(W)$. Writing $f^{*}=F(f)$, we have $f^{*}: F(T) \rightarrow F(W)$. The map $\theta_{\xi}(W)$ is defined by $f \mapsto f^{*}(\xi)$. It is easy to see that $\theta_{\xi}(W)$ is functorial in $W \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, whence we have a natural transformation $\theta_{\xi}: h_{T} \rightarrow F$. The association $\xi \mapsto \theta_{\xi}$ gives us a map $F(T) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathscr{C}}}\left(h_{T}, F\right)$. Conversely, given a map $\theta: h_{T} \rightarrow F$ in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$, we get an element $\xi_{\theta} \in F(T)$ defined as the image of $\mathbf{1}_{T} \in h_{T}(T)=\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}}^{/ S}$ (T, $\left.T\right)$ in $F(T)$ under $\theta(T): h_{T}(T) \rightarrow$ $F(T)$. One checks, in the usual way, that $\theta_{\xi_{\theta}}=\theta$ and $\xi_{\theta_{\xi}}=\xi$, whence we get the isomorphism (1.1.3).

The isomorphisms (1.1.2) and (1.1.3) are often referred to as the Yoneda lemmas. They are best summarized as a statement, namely:

Theorem 1.1.4. (Yoneda)
(a) The functor $h_{(\cdot)}: \mathbb{S} c h_{/ S} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ of (1.1.1) is a fully faithful embedding of $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ into $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$.
(b) Given $T \in \mathbb{S} c h_{/ S}$ and $F:\left(\mathbb{S}_{/ S}\right)^{\circ} \rightarrow$ (Sets) a functor, and identifying $T$ with $h_{T} \in \widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ via part (a), we have a one-to-one correspondence between $F(T)$ and maps $T \rightarrow F$ in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$.

From now on we will identify $T \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ with $h_{T}$, and we will treat the isomorphism (1.1.3) as an identity. Thus, with these identifications, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Hom}_{\widehat{\mathscr{C}}}(T, F)=F(T) \quad\left(T \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}, F \in \widehat{\mathscr{C}}\right) \tag{1.1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This should be compared with the special case $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}}(T, X)=X(T)$.
Remark 1.1.6. The alert reader would have recognized that in the proof of Theorem 1.1.4, the category $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ played no essential role, and could have been replaced by an arbitray category $\mathscr{C}$.
1.2. The structural morphism for objects in $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$. Recall that we are working with schemes over a fixed ambient scheme $S$. When we write $X \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ we are really using a shorthand for $(X \rightarrow S) \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$. The map $X \rightarrow S$ is often called the structural map or sometimes just the structure map. If $S=\operatorname{Spec} A$ is affine, we call
$X \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ an $A$-scheme rather than an $S$-scheme and often write $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ A}$ instead of $\operatorname{Sch}_{/ S}$.

Given an $S$-scheme $X$, note that $h_{S}(X)$ is a singleton set whose only element is the structural map $X \rightarrow S$. For $F \in \widehat{\mathscr{C}}$, we have a natural map $F \rightarrow h_{S}$ namely the map such that for $X \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, the induced map $F(X) \rightarrow h_{S}(X)$ is the map sending all elements of $F(X)$ to the only element of $h_{S}(X)$. It is clear that this (as $X$ varies in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ ) is functorial in $X$. Identifying (as we have agreed to) $h_{S}$ with $S$, we thus have a map

$$
\begin{equation*}
F \rightarrow S \tag{1.2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which we call the structural map for $F$. In the event the object $F$ of $\widehat{\mathscr{C}}$ lies in the smaller category $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, clearly the above notion of the structural map coincides with the notion defined for schemes over $S$.

## 2. Descent for closed subschemes

2.1. Decent for fpqc maps. As usual, for any map $T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}, T^{\prime \prime}$ and $T^{\prime \prime \prime}$ will be given by $T^{\prime \prime}:=T^{\prime} \times_{T} T^{\prime}$ and $T^{\prime \prime \prime}:=T^{\prime} \times_{T} T^{\prime} \times_{T} T^{\prime}$. The maps $p_{1}, p_{2}: T^{\prime \prime} \rightrightarrows T^{\prime}$ denote the two projections and $p_{12}, p_{13} p_{23}$ the three projections from $T^{\prime \prime \prime}$ to $T^{\prime \prime}$.

Suppose $p: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ is fpqc. We have a commutative diagram (with all six faces cartesian):


Since descent (obviously) works for Zariski covers, and we have proved that it works for faithfully flat and quasi-compact maps, therefore it works for fpqc maps (see the October 17 notes for the definition of fpqc maps). We're using the fact that the fpqc topology on $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ is generated by the Zariski topology and the topology given by faithfully flat and quasi-compact maps. In other words if $\mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ is a quasicoherent sheaf on $T^{\prime}$ and we have an isomorphism $\varphi: p_{2}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sim} p_{1}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ such that $p_{12}^{*}(\varphi) \circ p_{23}{ }^{*}(\varphi)=p_{13}^{*}(\varphi)$, then up to isomorphism, there is a unique quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on $T$ satisfying $p^{*} \mathscr{F}=\mathscr{F}^{\prime}$.
Exercise: Using the various characterizations of fpqc maps given in the October 17 notes, show directly that descent for fpqc maps follows from descent for faithfully flat and quasi-compact maps. [Hint: First reduce to $T=\operatorname{Spec} A$. Next, pick a quasi-compact open subscheme $V^{\prime}$ of $T^{\prime}$ such that $p\left(V^{\prime}\right)=T$. Then $V^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ is a quasi-compact faithfully flat map. Descent works for this, and we have obtain a quasi-coherent sheaf $\mathscr{F}$ on $T$. To show that the end-product (i.e. $\mathscr{F}$ ) is independent of the process, consider $V=V^{\prime} \cup V^{\prime \prime}$ where $V^{\prime \prime}$ is another quasi-compact open subscheme of $T^{\prime}$ which maps surjectively onto $T$, and use the fact that $V$ is also
quasi-compact, so that descent works for $V \rightarrow T$. The uniqueness of the descended sheaf should give you the required result.]

Lemma 2.1.1. Let $p: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ be a map in $\mathbb{S}_{\text {sh }}^{/ S}$. With notations as above, suppose we have a map $f^{\prime}: T^{\prime} \rightarrow X$ in $\mathbb{S} c h / S$ such that $f^{\prime} \circ p_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ p_{2}$. Then $f^{\prime}$ is constant on the fibers of $p$, i.e., if $z_{1}, z_{2} \in p^{-1}(t)$ for some $t \in T$, then $f^{\prime}\left(z_{1}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(z_{2}\right)$.

Proof. As usual, write $k\left(z_{1}\right), k\left(z_{2}\right)$ and $k(t)$ for the residue fields at $z_{1}, z_{2}$ and $t$ respectively. Let $R=k\left(z_{1}\right) \otimes_{k(x)} k\left(z_{2}\right)$. We have two maps $g_{1}, g_{2}: \operatorname{Spec} R \rightrightarrows T^{\prime}$ given by the composites $\operatorname{Spec} R \rightarrow \operatorname{Spec} k\left(z_{i}\right) \rightarrow T^{\prime}, i=1,2$. By definition of a fiber product we have a unique $\operatorname{map}\left(g_{1}, g_{2}\right): \operatorname{Spec} R \rightarrow T^{\prime \prime}$ such that $p_{i} \circ\left(g_{1}, g_{2}\right)=g_{i}$ for $i=1,2$. Since $f^{\prime} \circ p_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ p_{2}$, it follows that $f^{\prime} \circ g_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ g_{2}$. Now, $g_{i}$ factors through $\left\{z_{i}\right\}=\operatorname{Spec} k\left(z_{i}\right)$, for $i=1,2$, whence $f^{\prime}\left(z_{1}\right)=f^{\prime}\left(z_{2}\right)$.
2.2. Descent for quotient sheaves. The following two results are found in [SGA 1]. For $Z \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ for $\mathscr{F}$ a quasi-coherent $\mathscr{O}_{Z}$-module, let $\operatorname{Quot}(\mathscr{F})$ denote the set of equivalence classes of quasi-coherent quotients of $\mathscr{F}$ in the category of quasicoherent $\mathscr{O}_{Z}$-modules. Here, two quotients $\theta_{1}: \mathscr{F} \rightarrow \mathscr{Q}_{1}$ and $\theta_{2}: \mathscr{F} \rightarrow \mathscr{Q}_{2}$ are considered equivalent if there is an isomorphism $\varphi: \mathscr{Q}_{2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathscr{Q}_{1}$ such that $\varphi \circ \theta_{2}=\theta_{1}$.

Proposition 2.2.1. [SGA 1, Exposé VIII, Corollaire 1.8] Let $p: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ be an fpqc-map and $\mathscr{G}$ a quasi-coherent $\mathscr{O}_{T}$-module. Then, the sequence of set-theoretic maps

$$
\operatorname{Quot}(\mathscr{G}) \rightarrow \operatorname{Quot}\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime}\right) \rightrightarrows \operatorname{Quot}\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime \prime}\right)
$$

is exact, where, with the standard notations, $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}=p^{*} \mathscr{G}, \mathscr{G}^{\prime \prime}=q^{*} \mathscr{G}$, and $q=p \circ p_{1}=$ $p \circ p_{2}: T^{\prime \prime} \rightarrow T$.

We should point out that in [SGA 1] the above result is proved for faithfully flat and quasi-compact maps, but the only ingredient used is descent for faithfully flat and quasi-compact maps, and therefore one can give a proof in the above situation also, as we now proceed to do. I am giving a slightly more elaborate proof than I meant to, making a distinction (for part of the proof) between $g^{*} f^{*}$ and $(f g)^{*}$ for a pair of composable maps $f$ and $g$. I believe making this distinction gives greater clarity to the proof.

Proof. There is a natural descent datum on $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}$ since $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}=p^{*} \mathscr{G}$. Let $\psi: p_{2}^{*} \mathscr{G}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sim} p_{1}^{*} \mathscr{G}^{\prime}$ be this descent data. In other words, if $\alpha_{1}: p_{1}^{*} p^{*} \mathscr{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} q^{*} \mathscr{G}$ and $\alpha_{2}: p_{2}^{*} p^{*} \mathscr{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} q^{*} \mathscr{G}$ are the natural isomorphisms then $\psi=\alpha_{1}^{-1} \circ \alpha_{2}$. Next suppose $\theta^{\prime}: \mathscr{G}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ is a quotient such that $p_{1}^{*} \theta^{\prime}$ is equivalent to $p_{2}^{*} \theta^{\prime}$. More precisely, suppose the two composites

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{G}^{\prime \prime}=q^{*} \mathscr{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} p_{1}^{*} \mathscr{G}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{p_{1}^{*} \theta^{\prime}} p_{1}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{G}^{\prime \prime}=q^{*} \mathscr{G} \xrightarrow{\sim} p_{2}^{*} \mathscr{G}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{p_{2}^{*} \theta^{\prime}} p_{2}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

are equivalent. We have to show that there is - up to isomorphism - a unique quasicoherent $\mathscr{O}_{T}$-module $\mathscr{F}$ together with a quotient $\theta: \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ such that the quotient $p^{*} \theta$ is equivalent to $\theta^{\prime}$. Let $\varphi: p_{2}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime} \xrightarrow{\sim} p_{1}^{*} \mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ be the isomorphism resulting from
the equivalence of the quotients (1) and (2) above. Note that we then have a commutative diagram:


This means that if $\varphi$ is a descent datum on $\mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ then $\theta^{\prime}$ gives a map of descent data $\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime}, \psi\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathscr{F}^{\prime}, \varphi\right)$. We will now show that $\left(\mathscr{F}^{\prime}, \varphi\right)$ is a descent datum. We will from now on identify $(f \circ g)^{*}$ with $g^{*} f^{*}$ in the usual way for composites of the form $p_{1} \circ p_{12}$ etc. Consider the diagram:


By Diagram (2.2.2) all the vertical rectangles commute. The top rectangle commutes, since $\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime}, \psi\right)$ is a descent datum. Since the vertical arrows are surjective (being quotient maps), the bottom rectangle also commutes. The commutativity of the bottom rectangle is the same saying $\left(\mathscr{F}^{\prime}, \varphi\right)$ is a descent datum. Now, $p: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ is fpqc, whence-by faithful flat decsent-the map $\theta^{\prime}: \mathscr{G}^{\prime} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ descends to a unique (up to isomorphism) map of quasi-coherent $\mathscr{O}_{T}$-modules $\theta: \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ and the map $\theta$ is necessarily surjective by faithful flatness of $p$.

We have as an immediate corollary:
Corollary 2.2.3. [SGA 1, Exposé VIII, Corollaire 1.9] For any scheme $X$, let $H(X)$ denote the set of closed subschemes of $X$. With this notation, and the conditions of Proposition 2.2.1, the sequence of sets

$$
H(T) \rightarrow H\left(T^{\prime}\right) \rightrightarrows H\left(T^{\prime \prime}\right)
$$

is exact.
Proof. Set $\mathscr{G}=\mathscr{O}_{T}$ in Proposition 2.2.1. Note that if $\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime}, \psi\right)$ a descent datum such that $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}$ is a sheaf of rings (resp. algebras) and $\psi$ is a map of sheaves of rings (resp. algebras), then $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}$ descends to a sheaf of rings (resp.algebras) $\mathscr{G}$. Moreover, if a map of descent datum $\theta^{\prime}:\left(\mathscr{G}^{\prime}, \psi\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathscr{F}^{\prime}, \varphi\right)$ is such that $\mathscr{G}^{\prime}, \mathscr{F}^{\prime}$ are sheaves of rings (resp. algebras) and $\psi, \varphi, \theta^{\prime}$ are maps of sheaves of rings (resp. algebras), then the descended map $\theta: \mathscr{G} \rightarrow \mathscr{F}$ is a map of sheaves of rings (resp. algebras). This follows easily from the proof of faithful flat descent.

Remark 2.2.4. Corollary 2.2 .3 is a compact way of saying the following: Let $T^{\prime} \xrightarrow{p} T$ be fpqc and let $Z^{\prime} \hookrightarrow T^{\prime}$ be a closed subscheme of $T^{\prime}$ such that $p_{1}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right)=$ $p_{2}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right)$. Then there is a unique closed subscheme $Z \hookrightarrow T$ such that $p^{-1}(Z)=Z^{\prime}$. Here, as is standard, the scheme structures on the closed subspaces $p_{1}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right) \hookrightarrow T^{\prime \prime}$, $p_{2}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right) \hookrightarrow T^{\prime \prime}$, and $p^{-1}(Z) \hookrightarrow T^{\prime}$ are given respectively by $p_{1}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right)=Z^{\prime} \times_{T^{\prime}} T^{\prime \prime}$, $p_{2}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime}\right)=T^{\prime \prime} \times_{T^{\prime}} Z^{\prime}$, and $p^{-1}(Z)=Z \times_{T} T^{\prime}$.

## 3. SCHEMES ARE FPQC-SHEAVES

Fix a scheme $S$. In this section we will prove that a scheme $X$ over $S$ is necessarily an fpqc-sheaf on $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$. More precisely, we will prove that $h_{X}$ is an fpqc-sheaf over $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$. Note that since the fpqc topology is finer than the Zariski, étale, and fppf topologies on $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, it follows that $X$ is a Zariski, étale, and an fppf-sheaf.
3.1. The problem restated. Fix $X \in \mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$. Suppose

is a cartesian diagram with $p$ (and hence $p_{1}$ and $p_{2}$ ) fpqc. In order to show that $h_{X}$ is an fpqc-sheaf we have to show that the sequence of sets

$$
h_{X}(T) \rightarrow h_{X}\left(T^{\prime}\right) \rightrightarrows h_{X}\left(T^{\prime \prime}\right)
$$

is exact, where the first arrow is $p^{*}$ and the double arrow arises from $p_{1}^{*}$ and $p_{2}^{*}$.
The problem can be rephrased as follows. Suppose $f^{\prime}: T^{\prime} \rightarrow X$ is a map in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ such that $f^{\prime} \circ p_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ p_{2}$. Then there is a unique map $f: T \rightarrow X$ in $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$ such that $f^{\prime}=f \circ p$. In other words, if the diagram of solid arrows below commutes, then the dotted arrow can be filled in a unique way to make the whole diagram commute.


We will first argue that the problem is local on $X$. Indeed, if $U$ is an open subscheme of $X$, then by Lemma 2.1.1 $f^{\prime-1}(U)=p^{-1}(V)$ for a unique subset $V$ of $T$, for $f^{\prime}$ is constant on the fibers of $p$. In Proposition 2.1.1 of the cheat-sheet for faithful flatness ${ }^{1}$, we stated that if a map is faithfully flat and quasi-compact then a subset of the target is open if and only if its inverse image (in the source) is open (see [EGA IV ${ }_{2}$, Corollaire 2.3.12] for a proof). It is not hard to show that this property carries over to fpqc maps (see [FGA-ICTP, p. 28, Proposition 2.35(vi)]

[^0]for a proof which assumes the earlier result from $\left[E G A I V_{2}\right]$ ). It follows that $V$ is open in $T$. Replacing $T^{\prime}$ by $V^{\prime}=p^{-1}(V)$ etc, we see that solving the problem for each member of an open cover of $X$ will solve the problem for $X$ (by the required uniqueness of the map $f$ ). Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that $X=\operatorname{Spec} A$. The advantage of this is that $X$ is then separated over $S$, whence the graph of $f^{\prime}$ is closed in $T^{\prime} \times{ }_{S} X$ by [EGA I, p. 135, Corollaire (5.4.3)] or by [EGA, p. 278, Corollaire (5.2.4)]. The reader needs to take note of the fact that in [EGA I], a scheme is by definition separated, and what we today call a scheme is called a prescheme. The terminlogy was changed in [EGA] to reflect the current usage.

Now suppose $Z^{\prime} \hookrightarrow T^{\prime} \times_{S} X$ is the graph of the $S$-map $f^{\prime}: T^{\prime} \rightarrow X$. Let $q: T^{\prime} \times{ }_{S}$ $X \rightarrow T \times X$, and $q_{i}: T^{\prime \prime} \times_{S} X \rightarrow T^{\prime} \times_{S} X, i=1,2$ be the maps induces by $p$ and $p_{i}(i=1,2)$ respectively. Since $f^{\prime} \circ p_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ p_{2}$, one checks, $q_{1}^{-1}\left(Z^{\prime \prime}\right)=q_{2}-1\left(Z^{\prime}\right)$, both sides being graphs of the common map $f^{\prime} \circ p_{1}=f^{\prime} \circ p_{2}$. By Corollary 2.2.3 (see also Remark 2.2.4), there is a unique closed subscheme $Z \hookrightarrow T \times_{S} X$ such that $q^{-1}(Z)=Z^{\prime}$. We have a cartesian square

and since $Z^{\prime}$ is the graph of $f^{\prime}$, the downward arrow on the left is an isomorphism. Now, $p$ is faithfully flat, whence the downward arrow on the right is also an isomorphism, as we shall show shortly. Such a $Z \hookrightarrow T \times{ }_{S} X$ must necessarily be the graph of an $S$-map $f: T \rightarrow X$. In fact $f$ is the composite

$$
T \xrightarrow{\sim} Z \hookrightarrow T \times_{S} X \xrightarrow{\text { projection }} X
$$

It remains to show that the downward arrow on the right is an isomorphism. First suppose $A \rightarrow A^{\prime}$ is a flat map of rings, and $B$ is an $A$-algebra, and $B^{\prime}=B \otimes_{A} A^{\prime}$. Now, by the flatness of $A \rightarrow A^{\prime}$, we have $\operatorname{ker}\left(A^{\prime} \rightarrow B^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{ker}(A \rightarrow B) \otimes_{A} A^{\prime}$ and $\operatorname{coker}\left(A^{\prime} \rightarrow B^{\prime}\right)=\operatorname{coker}(A \rightarrow B) \otimes_{A} A^{\prime}$. If $A \rightarrow A^{\prime}$ is faithfully flat and $A^{\prime} \rightarrow B^{\prime}$ is an isomorphism, then from the above it follows that $\operatorname{ker}(A \rightarrow B)=$ $0=\operatorname{coker}(A \rightarrow B)$. Thus $A \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism. The general problem can be reduced to this. First note that the map $Z \rightarrow T$ is affine, since the base change of its higher direct images is zero ( $Z^{\prime} \rightarrow T^{\prime}$ being an isomorphism) and the base change map $p: T^{\prime} \rightarrow T$ is faithfully flat. Therefore, since the question is local on $T$, we may assume $T$ (and hence $Z$ ) is affine. Next, since $p$ is fpqc, we can find a quasi-compact open subset of $T^{\prime}$ which maps surjectively on to $T$. Replacing $T^{\prime}$ by this open subscheme, we are reduced to the case where $T^{\prime}$ is quasi-compact. Finally, in the usual way (by taking a finite disjoint union of affine open subschemes) we may replace $T^{\prime}$ by an affine scheme, and now we are in the affine situation which we handled earlier.

We summarize the above in the form of the following theorem:
Theorem 3.1.2. Let $X$ be an $S$-scheme. Then $X$ is a sheaf on the fpqc site (whence on the Zariski, étale, and fppf sites) on $\mathbb{S} c h_{/ S}$.

We point out that the hierarchy of topologies on $\mathbb{S c h}_{/ S}$, with the arrows pointing toward finer topologies, is:

$$
\text { Zariski } \rightarrow \text { étale } \rightarrow \text { fppf } \rightarrow \text { fpqc. }
$$
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