

# SUMMARY

DANNY KRASHEN

## CONTENTS

1. Central simple algebras and Azumaya algebras	1
1.1. Central simple algebras	1
1.2. Azumaya algebras	2
2. Galois extension of rings	2
2.1. étale extensions of fields	3
2.2. Galois étale extensions of fields	3
2.3. Etale extensions of commutative rings	4
2.4. Galois extensions of commutative rings	4
3. Galois Descent – an equivalence of categories	4
4. Galois Descent – twisted forms and obstructions	5
Twisted forms and $H^1$	5
Descent obstructions and $H^2$	6
5. The context of Schemes	8
5.1. Galois descent for line bundles	9
6. (Etale) descent	9
Appendix A. semilinear spaces (the descent data category) with exercises	11
Appendix B. twisted forms (the gluing problem) with exercises	12
References	13

## 1. CENTRAL SIMPLE ALGEBRAS AND AZUMAYA ALGEBRAS

### 1.1. Central simple algebras.

**Definition 1.1.** We say that an algebra  $A$  over a field  $F$  is a central simple  $F$ -algebra if

- $Z(A) = F$ , and  $\dim_F A < \infty$  ( $A$  is  $F$ -central),
- $A$  has no nontrivial 2-sided ideals ( $A$  is simple).

**Definition 1.2.** We say that an algebra  $A$  over a field  $F$  is a central division algebra if it is a central simple algebra which is a division ring. That is, if it is and  $F$ -central division algebra.

Let's recall the various characterizations we have made for central simple algebras.

**Proposition 1.3.** *Let  $A$  be a finite dimensional algebra over a field  $F$ . Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1)  $A$  is a central simple  $F$ -algebra,

---

*Date:* March 19, 2024.

- (2)  $A \cong M_n(D)$  where  $D$  is an  $F$ -central division algebra,
- (3) The “sandwich map”  $A \otimes_F A^{op} \rightarrow \text{End}_F(A)$  via  $a \otimes b \mapsto (x \mapsto axb)$  is an isomorphism,
- (4) there exists an  $F$ -algebra  $B$  such that  $A \otimes B \cong M_n(F)$  for some  $n$ ,
- (5) there exists an  $F$ -algebra  $B$  such that  $A \otimes B$  is a central simple  $F$ -algebra,
- (6) there exists a field extension  $E/F$  such that  $A \otimes E \cong M_n(E)$  for some  $n$ ,
- (7) there exists a separable field extension  $E/F$  such that  $A \otimes E \cong M_n(E)$  for some  $n$ ,
- (8)  $A \otimes \bar{F} \cong M_n(\bar{F})$  for some  $n$ .

One more equivalent condition we didn’t prove, but which is worth mentioning is that  $A$  be a projective module over the enveloping algebra  $A \otimes_F A^{op}$  (i.e. the multiplication map  $A \otimes A^{op} \rightarrow A$  splits).

**1.2. Azumaya algebras.** To generalize from fields to commutative rings, we define the concept of Azumaya.

In the following proposition, for a commutative ring  $R$  and a prime  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ , we will write  $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$  to denote the field  $\text{frac}(R/\mathfrak{p})$  (also called the residue field of  $\mathfrak{p}$ ).

**Proposition 1.4.** *For an algebra  $A$  over a commutative ring  $R$  which is finitely generated and projective as a module, the following are equivalent:*

- (1) for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ ,  $A \otimes_R \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$  is a central simple  $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ -algebra,
- (2) the sandwich map  $A \otimes_R A^{op} \rightarrow \text{End}_R(A)$  is an isomorphism.

**Definition 1.5.** If the equivalent conditions of Proposition 1.4 hold, we say that  $A$  is an Azumaya algebra over  $R$  (also called a central separable algebra over  $R$ ).

Just as a side comment – it turns out that when  $A/R$  is Azumaya it will follow that  $A$  is finitely presented as an  $R$  module and is a generator in the category of  $R$  modules (recall that  $M$  is a generator if for every other  $R$ -module  $N$ , there is a surjective map  $M^I \twoheadrightarrow N$  for some index set  $I$ ). So being an Azumaya algebra imposes serious module-theoretic constraints on an algebra.

## 2. GALOIS EXTENSION OF RINGS

Much like the story for division algebras, while we may start by wanting to construct interesting examples of (central) division algebras, it is useful to consider instead central simple algebras. There are a few natural reasons that this kind of consideration comes up:

- many natural constructions which sometimes yield division algebras will often produce central simple algebras instead,
- when we construct central simple algebras, by the Wedderburn structure theorem, we may find that we have constructed division algebras within them,
- division algebras are not “preserved by scalar extension.” In other words, if  $D/F$  is a central division algebra, and  $E/F$  is a field extension,  $D \otimes_F E$  will be central simple, but need not be division.

A very similar discussion arises when considering Galois extension, which leads us to consider the concept of Galois extensions of the form  $E/F$  where  $E$  need not be a field. From here we will then proceed to consider the case where both  $F$  and  $E$  are replaced by more general commutative rings (in some analogy with the concept of Azumaya algebras).

**2.1. étale extensions of fields.** Let's start with the generalization of the concept of a (not necessarily Galois) separable field extension, before considering the Galois case:

**Definition 2.1** (Étale extensions of fields). Let  $F$  be a field. We say that a commutative  $F$ -algebra  $E/F$  is étale over  $F$  if we can write  $E$  as a finite (possibly empty) product  $E = \prod_{i \in I} E_i$  where each  $E_i$  is a separable field extension of  $F$ .

We note that in the literature, one also says that  $E/F$  is a separable extension of rings.

**2.1.1. A strange digression into empty rings.** Let us take just a moment to discuss the edge case in which the product is empty. By convention, an empty product is a final object in a category, and here, considering ourselves to be in the category of unital commutative rings, we find that this final object is the “zero ring,” consisting of a single element  $0 = 1$ . While this ring is not actually a field (because, for example, its nonzero elements fail to form a group, not having an identity element), we still consider the zero ring to be a product of fields, as it is an empty product of fields. Consequently it is an étale extension of every field.

**2.2. Galois étale extensions of fields.** We may or may not get to proving all these equivalent conditions, but here are some ways we can characterize what it means for an étale extension to be Galois.

Recall the following definition:

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $S$  be a ring and  $G$  a finite group acting on  $S$  as automorphisms. We define  $(S, G, 1)$ , the twisted group ring, to be the algebra generated by  $S$  and symbols  $u_\sigma$  for  $\sigma \in G$ , so that as a left  $S$ -module we have

$$(S, G, 1) = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in G} Su_\sigma,$$

with multiplication given by the rules

$$u_\sigma u_\tau = u_{\sigma\tau} \quad \text{and} \quad u_\sigma x = \sigma(x)u_\sigma, \text{ for } x \in S, \sigma, \tau \in G.$$

**Definition/Lemma 2.3.** Let  $F$  be a field and  $E$  a commutative  $F$ -algebra and let  $G \subset \text{Aut}(E/F)$  be a group of automorphisms of  $E$  fixing  $F$ . We say that  $E$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension of  $F$  if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1)  $|G| = \dim_F E$  and  $E^G = F$ ,
- (2)  $(E, G, 1)$  is a central simple  $F$ -algebra,
- (3) the natural map  $(E, G, 1) \rightarrow \text{End}_F(E)$  is an isomorphism,
- (4) the natural map  $(E, G, 1) \rightarrow \text{End}_F(E)$  is injective (i.e. Dedekind's Lemma holds),
- (5) we can write  $E = \bigotimes_{i \in I} E_i$  with  $E_i/F$  separable extensions, and such that the induced action of  $G$  on  $I$  is transitive and for each  $i \in I$ ,  $E_i/F$  is  $\text{Stab}_G(i)$ -Galois.

An important thing to note is that there is generally no canonical choice for the group  $G$  for a given  $F$ -algebra  $E$ . So, for example, the  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebra  $\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  can be regarded as Galois

- with respect to the group  $C_2 \times C_2 = \langle \sigma, \tau \mid \sigma^2, \tau^2 \rangle$  via the action  $\sigma(z_1, z_2) = (z_2, z_1)$  and  $\tau(z_1, z_2) = (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2)$ , or
- with respect to the group  $C_4 = \langle \gamma \mid \gamma^4 \rangle$  via the action  $\gamma(z_1, z_2) = (z_2, \bar{z}_1)$ .

**2.3. Etale extensions of commutative rings.** We will come back to this a bit later when considering étale cohomology and more general descent, but let's define, as we are now able to, the notions of what it means for an extension of commutative rings to be étale.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. We say that an  $R$ -algebra  $S$  is étale if it is finitely **presented** generated and flat as an  $R$ -module, and if, for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ , we have  $S \otimes_R \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$  is an étale extension of the field  $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ .

**2.4. Galois extensions of commutative rings.** As with the notion of Azumaya, we are now ready to present the notion of what it means for an extension of rings to be Galois.

**Definition/Lemma 2.5.** Let  $R$  be a commutative ring and  $S$  a commutative  $R$ -algebra. Let  $G \subset \text{Aut}(S/R)$  be a group of automorphisms of  $S$  fixing  $R$ . We say that  $S$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension of  $R$  if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) for every  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(R)$ ,  $S \otimes_R \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension over  $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ ,
- (2)  $(S, G, 1)$  is an Azumaya algebra over  $R$ ,
- (3) the natural map  $(S, G, 1) \rightarrow \text{End}_R(S)$  is an isomorphism.

While not obvious from the definitions, the condition that  $S/R$  is  $G$ -Galois also imposes strong module-theoretic constraints on  $S$ , namely that  $S$  is a finitely generated projective  $R$ -module which is a generator in the category of  $R$ -modules. These conditions also imply that  $S^G = R$  (as expected from usual Galois theory).

### 3. GALOIS DESCENT – AN EQUIVALENCE OF CATEGORIES

One important consequence of Definition/Lemma 2.5 this is that the Morita theorems apply (see Proposition A.2), and we obtain an equivalence of categories as follows:

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $S/R$  be a  $G$ -Galois extension of commutative rings. Then we obtain an equivalence of categories

$$\begin{aligned} R\text{-modules} &\leftrightarrow (S, G, 1)\text{-modules} \\ M &\mapsto S \otimes_R M \end{aligned}$$

via the standard  $(S, G, 1) \cong \text{End}_R(S)$ -module structure on  $S$ .

We can make this particularly useful by recalling the notion of semilinear actions.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $G$  be a group acting on a commutative ring  $S$  and let  $M$  be an  $S$ -module. A  $G$ -semilinear action on  $M$  is an action of  $G$  on  $M$  as an Abelian group such that for each  $\sigma \in G$ ,  $m \in M$ ,  $x \in S$ , we have  $\sigma(xm) = \sigma(x)\sigma(m)$ .

A  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -module is defined to be an  $S$ -module with a  $G$ -semilinear action.

We may then consider the category of such  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -modules and observe that this category is also equipt with a tensor product (monoidal) structure. That is, if  $M_1, M_2$  are  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -modules, we can define  $M_1 \otimes_S M_2$  to have a  $G$ -semilinear action via

$$\sigma(m_1 \otimes m_2) = \sigma(m_1) \otimes \sigma(m_2).$$

With this notion, we can then define the notion of a  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -algebra (via its structural maps such as  $A \otimes_S A \rightarrow A$  satisfying various axioms).

We note the following fact, which is easily verified via the definitions:

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $S$  be a ring with an action of a group  $G$ . Then there is an equivalence (actually an isomorphism) of categories between  $(S, G, 1)$ -modules  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -modules.*

Combining Lemma 3.3 with Lemma 3.1, we obtain the following:

**Theorem 3.4** (Galois descent). *Let  $S/R$  be a  $G$ -Galois extension of commutative rings. Then we obtain an equivalence of categories*

$$\begin{aligned} R\text{-modules} &\leftrightarrow G\text{-semilinear } S\text{-modules} \\ M &\mapsto S \otimes_R M \\ N^G &\hookleftarrow N. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, this equivalence respects tensor products.

We verified implicitly that one of these directions gives an equivalence (at least, by quoting Morita theory). The other direction is given in the exercises.

#### 4. GALOIS DESCENT – TWISTED FORMS AND OBSTRUCTIONS

The fundamental question of Galois descent is the following: given a  $G$ -Galois extension of commutative rings  $S/R$ , how can one go between algebraic structures over  $R$  and algebraic structures over  $S$ ? We can phrase this in terms of two concrete questions:

**Question 4.1.** *Given an  $R$  algebra  $A$ , how can we describe all  $R$  algebras  $A'$  such that  $A \otimes S \cong A' \otimes S$ ?*

**Question 4.2.** *Given an  $S$  algebra  $B$ , when can we find an  $R$  algebra  $A$  such that  $A \otimes S \cong B$ ?*

##### TWISTED FORMS AND $H^1$

Question 4.1 is in large part the subject of the exercises, and we recall here the conclusions. In the context of Theorem 3.4, we can reframe this first question as follows. Given a semilinear action of  $G$  on an  $S$ -algebra  $B$  (for example,  $B = S \otimes A$ ), how can we describe all other semilinear actions on  $B$ . These other actions, via Theorem 3.4, would correspond to  $R$ -algebras  $A'$  such that  $S \otimes A' \cong B$ . Recall the following definitions:

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X, Y$  be sets with action by a group  $G$ . Then we obtain a natural action on the set of maps  $\text{Map}(X, Y)$  via  $(\sigma \cdot f)(x) \equiv \sigma(f(\sigma^{-1}(x)))$ .

**Definition 4.4.** Let  $G, A$  be groups, and suppose we have a homomorphism  $G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A)$  providing an action of  $G$  on  $A$ . We say that a map  $\alpha : G \rightarrow A$  is a crossed homomorphism, or a 1-cocycle, if

$$\alpha(\sigma\tau) = \alpha(\sigma)\sigma(\alpha(\tau)), \quad \forall \sigma, \tau \in G.$$

We write  $Z^1(G, A)$  for the set of all crossed homomorphisms.

**Definition 4.5.** The group  $A$  acts on  $Z^1(G, A)$  via  $(a \cdot \alpha)(\sigma) = a\alpha(\sigma)\sigma(a)^{-1}$ , and we define  $H^1(G, A) = Z^1(G, A)/A$  to be the set of orbits under this action.

We note that in the case  $A$  is an Abelian group, this corresponds to the standard group cohomology construction, and the sets  $Z^1(G, A)$  and  $H^1(G, A)$  have natural group structure given by pointwise multiplication in  $A$ . In general, however, these are just sets with distinguished elements (pointed sets), where the distinguished element comes from the crossed homomorphism  $G \rightarrow A$  sending all elements to the identity.

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $B$  be a  $G$ -semilinear  $S$ -algebra, with action written as  $(\sigma, b) \mapsto \sigma b$ . Consider the  $G$ -action on  $\text{Aut}_S(B)$  given by Definition 4.3. Then if we have any other  $G$ -semilinear action on  $B$ ,  $(\sigma, b) \mapsto \sigma \cdot b$ , then we may find a crossed homomorphism  $\alpha : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_S(B)$  such that*

$$\sigma \cdot b = \alpha(\sigma)\sigma b,$$

*and this gives a bijection between crossed homomorphism and semilinear actions.*

*Further, if  $\alpha, \beta \in Z^1(G, \text{Aut}_S(B))$  are crossed homomorphisms, then the resulting semilinear algebras are isomorphic if and only if  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are in the same  $\text{Aut}_S(B)$  orbit. In particular, we have a bijection between isomorphism classes of algebras  $A'/R$  such that  $S \otimes A' \cong B$  and the pointed set  $H^1(G, \text{Aut}_S(B))$ .*

## DESCENT OBSTRUCTIONS AND $H^2$

We now consider the Question 4.2 – given an  $S$ -algebra  $B$ , when can we find an  $R$ -algebra  $A$  such that  $S \otimes_R A \cong B$ ? In light of Theorem 3.4, this is equivalent to asking the question of when we are able to define a semilinear action of  $G$  on  $B$ .

To make this easier to work with, let's define a bit of language:

**Definition 4.7.** Let  $B$  be an  $S$ -algebra and let  $\sigma$  be an automorphism of  $S$ . We define a new  $S$ -algebra, denoted  ${}^\sigma S$  to have underlying set  ${}^\sigma x$ ,  $x \in S$  (that is, there is a bijection between the elements of  $B$  and  ${}^\sigma B$ ), with operations:

$${}^\sigma x + {}^\sigma y = {}^\sigma(x + y), \quad ({}^\sigma x)({}^\sigma y) = {}^\sigma(xy), \quad \forall x, y \in B$$

and with  $S$ -module structure given by:

$$\lambda {}^\sigma x = {}^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(\lambda)x), \quad \forall \lambda \in S, x \in B,$$

or in other words,  $\sigma(\lambda) {}^\sigma x = {}^\sigma(\lambda x)$ .

**Example 4.8.** *As an example, note that if  $B$  is an  $S$ -algebra with a free  $S$ -module basis  $e_i$  and with multiplication table given by*

$$e_i e_j = \sum_k c_{i,j}^k e_k,$$

*then the algebra  ${}^\sigma B$  has multiplication table given by*

$${}^\sigma e_i {}^\sigma e_j = \sum_k \sigma(c_{i,j}^k) {}^\sigma e_k.$$

Now, back to the case of a  $G$ -Galois extension  $S/R$  and an  $S$ -algebra  $B$ , we would like to ask whether or not it is possible to define a semilinear action of  $G$  on  $B$ . This amounts to defining, for every  $\sigma \in G$  a “possible action,”

$$\phi_\sigma : B \rightarrow B$$

which will satisfy  $\phi_\sigma(\lambda x) = \sigma(\lambda)\phi_\sigma(x)$  for  $\lambda \in S, x \in B$ , and such that  $\phi_\sigma\phi_\tau = \phi_{\sigma\tau}$ . One complicating factor is that such maps  $\phi_\sigma$  are evidently not  $S$ -linear, but we can change our perspective by considering the corresponding maps  $\psi_\sigma : {}^\sigma B \rightarrow B$  given by  $\psi_\sigma({}^\sigma x) = \phi_\sigma(x)$ . For this map, we find

$$\psi_\sigma(\lambda {}^\sigma x) = \psi_\sigma({}^\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(\lambda)x)) = \phi_\sigma(\sigma^{-1}(\lambda)x) = \lambda\phi_\sigma(x) = \lambda\psi_\sigma({}^\sigma x),$$

which allows us to encode the information of  $\phi_\sigma$  as an  $S$ -linear map  $\psi_\sigma$ . If we let  $\sigma : B \rightarrow {}^\sigma B$  denote the map  $x \mapsto {}^\sigma x$  (which we can think of as a “universal”  $\sigma$ -linear map), then we can consider this via the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^\sigma B & \xrightarrow{\psi_\sigma} & B \\ \sigma \uparrow & & \parallel \\ B & \xrightarrow{\phi_\sigma} & B \end{array}$$

as  $\psi_\sigma(x) = \sigma(\phi_\sigma(\sigma^{-1}x))$ . More generally, we may “twist” these to obtain maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} {}^{\sigma\tau} B & \xrightarrow{{}^\sigma\psi_\tau} & {}^\sigma B \\ \sigma \uparrow & & \uparrow \sigma \\ {}^\tau B & \xrightarrow{\psi_\tau} & B \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\sigma\psi_\tau : {}^{\sigma\tau} B &\rightarrow {}^\sigma B, \\ {}^{\sigma\tau} x &\mapsto \sigma(\psi_\tau({}^\tau x)) = {}^\sigma\phi_\tau(x). \end{aligned}$$

This perspective allows us to interpret the condition  $\phi_\sigma\phi_\tau = \phi_{\sigma\tau}$  in terms of  $S$ -linear maps. That is, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\sigma\tau} : {}^{\sigma\tau} B &\rightarrow B, \\ {}^{\sigma\tau} x &\mapsto \phi_{\sigma\tau}(x), \end{aligned}$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_\sigma {}^\sigma\psi_\tau : {}^{\sigma\tau} B &\rightarrow B, \\ {}^{\sigma\tau} x &\mapsto \phi_\sigma\phi_\tau(x). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the condition  $\phi_\sigma\phi_\tau = \phi_{\sigma\tau}$  corresponds to the condition  $\psi_{\sigma\tau} = \psi_\sigma {}^\sigma\psi_\tau$ .

Analyzing the possibilities, we see:

**Case 1:**  ${}^\sigma B$  and  $B$  are not isomorphic for some  $\sigma \in G$ .

In this case, there is no possible way that  $\sigma$  can act on  $B$ , and so no hope for defining a semilinear action of  $B$ . Consequently, there is no algebra  $A/R$  such that  $S \otimes A \cong B$ .

**Case 2:** There exist isomorphisms  $\psi_\sigma : {}^\sigma B \xrightarrow{\sim} B$  for each  $\sigma \in G$ .


In this case, we need only consider whether or not these can be chosen so that  $\psi_{\sigma\tau} = \psi_\sigma {}^\sigma\psi_\tau$ . To measure our “distance” from this condition, and make a connection with group cohomology, we define:<sup>1</sup>

$$\beta(\sigma, \tau) = \psi_{\sigma\tau}^{-1} \psi_\sigma {}^\sigma\psi_\tau \in \text{Aut}_S(B).$$

---

<sup>1</sup>note, this is a somewhat different convention than the one we did in class

We are successful if we can choose  $\phi_\sigma$  so as to make  $\beta(\sigma, \tau) = 1$  for all  $\sigma, \tau$ . Tracing the following diagram:



we find

$$\beta(\sigma\tau, \gamma)\beta(\sigma, \tau) = \beta(\sigma, \tau\gamma) \psi_\sigma^\sigma \beta(\tau, \gamma) \psi_\sigma^{-1}.$$

which we can think of as a nonabelian version of a 2-cocycle condition, although we won't try to define this "cohomology set" precisely here.

Of course, changing our isomorphisms  $\phi_\sigma$  (and hence the maps  $\psi_\sigma$ ) will alter our choice of  $\beta$ 's. More precisely, if  $\phi'_\sigma : B \rightarrow B$  is another  $\sigma$ -linear isomorphism, with corresponding isomorphism  $\psi'_\sigma : {}^\sigma B \rightarrow B$ , we see that  $\psi'_\sigma \psi_\sigma^{-1} \equiv \rho(\sigma) \in \text{Aut}_S(B)$ , and so  $\psi'_\sigma = \rho(\sigma) \psi_\sigma$  for some unique automorphism  $\rho(\sigma)$ , and conversely, different choices of isomorphisms  $\psi$  correspond to arbitrary functions  $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_S(B)$ . Given such a  $\rho$  corresponding to  $\phi'$ , we find that the corresponding  $\beta'$  is given by

$$\beta'(\sigma, \tau) = (\psi'_{\sigma\tau})^{-1} \psi'^\sigma_\sigma \psi'_\tau = \psi_{\sigma\tau}^{-1} \rho(\sigma\tau)^{-1} \rho(\sigma) \psi_\sigma^\sigma \rho(\tau)^\sigma \psi_\tau.$$

In general, this is a difficult formula to interpret, but with sufficient commutativity, it will reduce to the standard notion of 2-cocycles and their equivalence via differing by a coboundary.

## 5. THE CONTEXT OF SCHEMES

We note that the previous machinery, which was introduced in the context of ring extensions, works perfectly well for schemes as well. Let's gather these definitions and observations in this situation:

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $X = (X, \mathcal{O}_X)$  be a scheme and let  $\mathcal{A}$  be a quasicoherent sheaf of associative  $\mathcal{O}_X$  algebras. We say that  $\mathcal{A}$  is Azumaya if for every affine open set  $\text{Spec } R = U \subset X$ ,  $\mathcal{A}(U)$  is an Azumaya algebra over  $R$ .

We see, essentially as a consequence of Proposition 1.4, that we can characterize Azumaya-ness as follows. Here for a scheme  $X$  and a point  $x \in X$ , we write  $\kappa(x)$  for the residue field of  $x$  – that is,  $\kappa(x) = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}/\mathfrak{m}_{X,x}$ . If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a sheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  algebras, we write  $\mathcal{F}|_x$  to mean  $\mathcal{F}_x \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} \kappa(x)$ .

**Proposition 5.2.** For a scheme  $X$  and  $\mathcal{A}$  a locally free and finitely generated sheaf of associative  $\mathcal{O}_X$  algebras, the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mathcal{A}$  is Azumaya,
- (2) for every point  $x \in X$ ,  $\mathcal{A}|_x$  is a central simple algebra over  $\kappa(x)$ ,



(3) the sandwich map  $\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{A}^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}nd_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{A})$  is an isomorphism (here  $\mathcal{E}nd$  denotes the endomorphism sheaf).

*Proof.* We leave the verification of this as an exercise, via Proposition 1.4.  $\square$

Next, we define the notion of an étale morphism, relying on the corresponding definition for rings from Definition 2.4.

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of schemes. We say that  $f$  is étale at  $x \in X$  if there exists an affine open neighborhood  $\text{Spec } B = V \subset X$  of  $x$ , and an affine open neighborhood  $\text{Spec } A = U \subset Y$  containing  $f(U)$ , such that  $B$  is an étale ring extension of  $A$ .

One thing that this definition should emphasize is that this definition is local on  $X^2$ . The following definition connects more directly to Definition 2.4.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of schemes. Then  $f$  is étale if and only if it is flat, locally of finite presentation, and for every  $y \in Y$ , the fiber  $X_y = X \times_Y y$  is the spectrum of an étale (commutative ring) extension of the field  $\kappa(y)$ .*

*Proof.* [Sta24, Tag 02GM]  $\square$

Let's now define the notion of a Galois extension of schemes. Note that, unlike the case of étale ring extensions, Galois extensions of rings are necessarily flat and locally free of finite rank. In particular, these are module finite maps. It follows that the corresponding type of map for schemes would be a finite map, and as such would be affine. Hence, we can talk about Galois extensions either as morphisms of schemes  $f : X \rightarrow Y$ , or as coherent sheaves of commutative  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -algebras corresponding to  $f_*\mathcal{O}_X$ .

**Definition/Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $Y$  a scheme and  $\mathcal{R}$  a sheaf of commutative  $\mathcal{O}_Y$  algebras, which are locally free of finite type as  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules. Suppose that  $G$  is a finite group of  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -linear automorphisms of  $\mathcal{R}$ . We say that  $f$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension if the following equivalent conditions are true:*

- (1) *for every open affine  $\text{Spec } S \subset Y$ ,  $\mathcal{R}(\text{Spec } S)/S$  is  $G$ -Galois,*
- (2) *the sheaf of algebras  $(\mathcal{R}, G, 1)$  is Azumaya over  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ ,*
- (3) *the natural map  $(\mathcal{R}, G, 1) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}nd_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\mathcal{R})$  is an isomorphism,*
- (4) *for every  $y \in Y$ ,  $\mathcal{R}|_y$  is a  $G$ -Galois commutative ring extension of the field  $\kappa(y)$  (as in Definition/Lemma 2.5, Definition/Lemma 2.3).*

The machinery of Section 4 goes through as previously described, and we will work through it via an example:

### 5.1. Galois descent for line bundles.

## 6. (ÉTALE) DESCENT

We would like to ask a question which is analogous to those we asked in Section 4, in the context of morphisms of schemes. Namely, for a morphism of schemes  $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ , how can one go between structures on  $Y$  and structures on  $X$ . That is, we have a natural functor  $\pi^*$ , taking sheaves on  $Y$  to sheaves on  $X$ . In some sense, this is a forgetful process. We would

---

<sup>2</sup>as an illustrative example, the doubled affine line mapping to the affine line is, locally on the domain, an isomorphism and hence étale

like to know how much information is lost, and what additional information is needed to “go backwards.”

We will use the psychological crutch of considering the case that  $X$  is a disjoint union of schemes  $X = \sqcup U_i$  so that the individual morphisms  $\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow Y$  are étale morphisms. But we will visualize these maps as open covers in terms of intuition. We will write  $U_{i,j}$  for the fiber product  $U_i \times_Y U_j$ , which we will think of as the analog of the intersection of two open sets. Similarly we define  $U_{i,j,k}$  as the triple fiber product  $U_i \times_Y U_j \times_Y U_k$ , etcetera. We write  $\pi_{i,j}$  to denote the map  $U_i \times_Y U_j \rightarrow Y$  (via the equal morphisms induced by  $\pi_i$  or  $\pi_j$ ).

In order to reduce the notational clutter, if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a sheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_Y$ -modules, we will write  $\mathcal{F}|_{i,j}$  to denote the sheaf  $\pi_{i,j}^* \mathcal{F}_{i,j}$ , and similarly for triple fiber products, etc.

So as to eliminate all possible suspense, let us simply give the “answer:” We first recall the notion of an étale covering:

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $Y$  be a scheme and  $\mathcal{U} = \{\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow Y\}$  a family of morphisms. We say that  $\mathcal{U}$  is an étale covering of  $Y$  if for all  $i$ ,  $\pi_i$  is an étale morphism, and if the family is jointly surjective. That is, if for every  $y \in Y$  a scheme-theoretic point, there exists  $u \in U_i$  for some  $i$  a scheme theoretic point, such that  $\pi_i(u) = y$ .

**Definition 6.2.** If  $\mathcal{U} = \{\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow Y\}$  is a family of morphisms, we define the descent category  $\text{Desc}(\mathcal{U}, \text{QCoh})$  to be the category whose objects are pairs  $((\mathcal{F}_i), (\phi_{i,j}))$  where each  $\mathcal{F}_i$  is a quasicoherent sheaf over  $U_i$  and where  $\phi_{i,j} : \mathcal{F}_i|_{i,j} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_j|_{i,j}$  are isomorphisms such that for all  $i, j, k$ , we have

$$\phi_{i,k}|_{i,j,k} = \phi_{j,k}|_{i,j,k} \circ \phi_{i,j}|_{i,j,k}.$$

Note that in the case where  $\mathcal{U}$  is an open covering, this is just describing gluing data for sheaves (see [Har77, Exercise II.1.22]). We say that descent holds if sheaves are exactly described by such gluing data. Note that there is always a canonical functor  $\text{QCoh}_Y \rightarrow \text{Desc}(\mathcal{U}, \text{QCoh})$  taking a sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $Y$  to the tuple  $((\mathcal{F}|_i), (1_{i,j}))$ , where  $1_{i,j}$  represents the canonical identification of  $\mathcal{F}|_i|_{i,j}$  with  $\mathcal{F}|_j|_{i,j}$  (both being canonical equal to  $\mathcal{F}|_{i,j}$ ).

**Theorem 6.3** (Etale descent). *Let  $\{\pi_i : U_i \rightarrow Y\}$  be an étale covering. Then the natural functor  $\text{QCoh}_Y \rightarrow \text{Desc}(\mathcal{U}, \text{QCoh})$  given by  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto ((\mathcal{F}|_i), (1_{i,j}))$  is an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* See (for a somewhat more general context) [Sta24, Tag 023T]. □

APPENDIX A. SEMILINEAR SPACES (THE DESCENT DATA CATEGORY) WITH EXERCISES

**Exercise 1.** If  $E/F$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension of fields, show that the natural map

$$\begin{aligned} (E, G, 1) &\rightarrow \text{End}_F(E) \\ x &\mapsto [y \mapsto xy], \quad x, y \in E \\ u_\sigma &\mapsto [y \mapsto \sigma(y)], \quad \sigma \in G, y \in E \end{aligned}$$

gives an isomorphism of algebras.

**Definition A.1.** Recall that if  $E/F$  is a  $G$ -Galois extension, an  $E/F$ -semilinear vector space is an  $E$ -vector space  $V$  together with an action of  $G$  on  $V$  such that for every  $x \in E$ ,  $v \in V$ , we have

$$\sigma(xv) = \sigma(x)\sigma(v).$$

A homomorphism of  $E/F$  semilinear vector spaces  $\phi : V \rightarrow W$  consists of an  $E$ -linear map  $\phi$  which commutes with the  $G$ -action in the sense that  $\phi(\sigma v) = \sigma(\phi v)$ .

**Exercise 2.** If  $V$  is an  $F$ -vector space then  $E \otimes_F V$  is naturally an  $E/F$  semilinear vector space, where the action of  $G$  is via the first factor.

**Exercise 3.** Show that we have an equivalence of categories between  $(E, G, 1)$ -modules and  $E/F$ -semilinear vector spaces.

Recall the following result which we claimed in the last lecture:

**Proposition A.2** (Morita). *Let  $R$  be a ring and  $P$  a right  $R$ -progenerator (i.e. finitely generated, projective generator in the category of right  $R$ -modules). Let  $S = \text{End}_R(P)$ . Then the functor from  $R$ -modules to  $S$ -modules given by*

$$N \mapsto P \otimes_R N$$

*is an equivalence of categories. Further, if  $P^\star = \text{Hom}_R(P, R)$  then  $P^\star$  is an  $R-S$  bimodule, and*

$$M \mapsto P^\star \otimes_S M$$

*gives the (homotopy) inverse equivalence.*

**Exercise 4.** Show that the functor from  $F$ -vector spaces to  $E/F$ -semilinear vector spaces given by

$$V \mapsto V_E \equiv E \otimes_F V$$

is an equivalence of categories.

Now, if we are interested in talking about algebraic objects (such as central simple algebras), we need more than just vector spaces and linear maps, but we also need the concept of the tensor product (for multiplicative structures).

**Definition A.3.** Suppose  $V, W$  are  $E/F$  semilinear vector spaces. Then  $V \otimes_E W$  is also a semilinear vector space with respect to the action:

$$\sigma(v \otimes w) = \sigma(v) \otimes \sigma(w).$$

**Exercise 5.** Show that the above definition gives a well defined  $E/F$  semilinear space and that this commutes with the functor given above.

That is, show that if  $V, W$  are  $F$ -vector spaces, then we have a natural isomorphism of  $E/F$  semilinear vector spaces

$$V_E \otimes_E W_E \cong (V \otimes_F W)_E.$$

More formally (if you like), this means you are showing that the two functors

$$(V, W) \mapsto (V_E \otimes_E W_E) \quad (V_W) \mapsto (V \otimes_F W)_E$$

from  $Vec/F \times Vec/F$  to the category of  $E/F$  semilinear vector spaces are naturally isomorphic.

From this point of view it makes sense to talk about  $E/F$  semilinear algebras.

**Definition A.4.** An  $E/F$  semilinear algebra is an  $E/F$  semilinear vector space  $A$ , together with an  $E/F$ -semilinear map

$$m : A \otimes_E A \rightarrow A$$

and an  $E/F$ -semilinear map

$$\iota : E \rightarrow A$$

which gives  $A$  the structure of an algebra (where  $\iota(1) = 1$  is the multiplicative identity of  $A$ ).

**Exercise 6.** Show that an  $E/F$  semilinear algebra is just an  $E$ -algebra  $A$  with a semilinear action of  $G$  on  $A$  as a vector space such that  $\sigma(ab) = \sigma(a)\sigma(b)$  (i.e. such that  $G$  acts via ring isomorphisms).

**Exercise 7.** Show that we have an equivalence of categories between  $F$ -algebras and  $E/F$ -semilinear algebras given by  $A \mapsto E \otimes_F A$ .

**Exercise 8.** It follows from the above exercise that if we let  $F = \mathbb{R}$  and  $E = \mathbb{C}$ , then we have an equivalence between  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras and  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebras with a notion of conjugation (action by  $\mathcal{G}al(\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R})$ ). In particular, if we consider the  $\mathbb{R}$ -algebras  $\mathbb{H}$  and  $M_2(\mathbb{R})$ , we see that

$$\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{H} \cong M_2(\mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} M_2(\mathbb{R})$$

and so as  $\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}$  semilinear algebras, both of these algebras are given as  $M_2(\mathbb{C})$  with two different notions of conjugation. What are these notions of conjugation?

## APPENDIX B. TWISTED FORMS (THE GLUING PROBLEM) WITH EXERCISES

Throughout the section, let us fix  $E/F$  a  $G$ -Galois extension.

**Definition B.1.** Let  $A$  be an  $F$ -algebra. We say that an  $F$ -algebra  $B$  is a(n  $E/F$ -)twisted form of  $A$  if there is an isomorphism of  $E$ -algebras,  $A_E \cong B_E$ .

Note that we are not assuming here that we have an isomorphism of  $E/F$  semilinear algebras (which would imply they were isomorphic over  $F$ ), but just as  $E$ -algebras.

As we saw in the previous section, we can recover the structure of  $B$  from  $B_E$  by specifying a semilinear action. As we are able to identify  $A_E$  and  $B_E$ , our quest to understanding the possible  $B$ 's we may have then reduces to understanding all possible semilinear actions of  $G$  on  $A_E$ .

**Definition B.2.** Suppose  $V$  is a vector space with an action of  $G$ . We define an action of  $G$  on  $\text{Aut}(V)$  by  $(\sigma\phi)(v) = \sigma(\phi(\sigma^{-1}(v)))$ .

**Exercise 9.** Show that in the case  $V = E^n$ , with component-wise action, the action of the Galois group  $G = \mathcal{G}\text{al}(E/F)$  on  $\text{Aut}(V) = GL_n(E)$  is given by the standard action on the matrix entries.

**Exercise 10.** Suppose  $\phi, \psi : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A_E)$  are two different semilinear actions of  $G$  on  $A_E$ . That is, for  $\sigma \in G$ , we have  $\sigma(a) \equiv \phi(\sigma)(a)$  and  $\sigma(a) \equiv \psi(\sigma)(a)$  define semilinear actions (note here that  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  need not have values in  $E$ -automorphisms, but in general just  $F$ -linear automorphisms).

Show that  $\phi(\sigma) = \alpha(\sigma)\psi(\sigma)$  for a map  $\alpha : G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A_E)$  and  $\alpha$  is a crossed homomorphism (where the action of  $G$  on  $\text{Aut}(A_E)$  here is given by the previous exercise via  $\psi$ ).

**Exercise 11.** Show that the above correspondence gives, after fixing an algebra  $A/F$  a bijection between semilinear actions on  $A_E$  and crossed homomorphisms  $G \rightarrow \text{Aut}_F(A_E)$ .

From this we see so far that for  $B/F$  a twisted form of  $A$ , given an isomorphism  $\phi : B_E \rightarrow A_E$ , we obtain a new semilinear action on  $A_E$  which corresponds to the algebra  $B/F$  via the equivalence of categories previously described. This semilinear action, in turn gives rise to crossed homomorphism  $G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(A_E)$ .

It therefore is natural to ask: in what way does this semilinear action depend on the isomorphism  $\phi$ ?

## REFERENCES

- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52.
- [Sta24] The Stacks project authors. The stacks project. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2024.