

# USING THE INTERNAL LANGUAGE OF TOPOSES IN ALGEBRAIC GEOMETRY

INGO BLECHSCHMIDT

ABSTRACT. There are several important topoi associated to a scheme, for instance the petit and gros Zariski topoi. These come with an internal mathematical language which closely resembles the usual formal language of mathematics, but is “local on the base scheme”:

For example, from the internal perspective, the structure sheaf looks like an ordinary local ring (instead of a sheaf of rings with local stalks) and vector bundles look like ordinary free modules (instead of sheaves of modules satisfying a certain condition). The translation of internal statements and proofs is facilitated by an easy mechanical procedure.

These expository notes give an introduction to this topic and show how the internal point of view can be exploited to give simpler definitions and more conceptual proofs of the basic notions and observations in algebraic geometry. No prior knowledge about topos theory and formal logic is assumed.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Kripke–Joyal semantics	2
3. Sheaves of rings	3
3.1. Reducedness	3
3.2. Locality	3
3.3. Field properties	3
4. Sheaves of modules	4
4.1. Finite type, finite presentation, coherence	4
5. Upper semicontinuous functions	5
5.1. Interlude on natural numbers	5
5.2. A geometric interpretation	6
5.3. The upper semicontinuous rank function	7
6. Rational functions and Cartier divisors	7
6.1. The sheaf of rational functions	7
6.2. Regularity of local functions	8
6.3. Geometric interpretation of the sheaf of rational functions	9
7. Relative spectrum	9
8. Modalities	9
9. Quasicoherent sheaves of modules	9
10. Unsorted	11

## 1. INTRODUCTION

## 2. KRIPKE-JOYAL SEMANTICS

Let  $X$  be a topological space. Later,  $X$  will be the underlying space of a scheme.

**Definition 2.1** (Kripke–Joyal semantics of a sheaf topos). The meaning of

$$U \models \varphi \quad (\text{“}\varphi \text{ holds on } U\text{”})$$

for open subsets  $U \subseteq X$  and formulas  $\varphi$  is given by the following rules, recursively in the structure of  $\varphi$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U \models f = g : \mathcal{F} & :\iff f|_U = g|_U \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{F}) \\ U \models \varphi \wedge \psi & :\iff U \models \varphi \text{ and } U \models \psi \\ U \models \varphi \vee \psi & :\iff \text{ ~~} U \models \varphi \text{ or } U \models \psi \text{~~ } \\ & \text{there exists a covering } U = \bigcup_i U_i \text{ s. th. for all } i: \\ & \quad U_i \models \varphi \text{ or } U_i \models \psi \\ U \models \varphi \Rightarrow \psi & :\iff \text{for all open } V \subseteq U: V \models \varphi \text{ implies } V \models \psi \\ U \models \forall f : \mathcal{F}. \varphi(f) & :\iff \text{for all sections } f \in \Gamma(V, \mathcal{F}), V \subseteq U: V \models \varphi(f) \\ U \models \exists f : \mathcal{F}. \varphi(f) & :\iff \text{ ~~there exists a section } f \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{F}) \text{ s. th. } U \models \varphi(f) \text{~~ } \\ & \text{there exists a covering } U = \bigcup_i U_i \text{ s. th. for all } i: \\ & \quad \text{there exists } f_i \in \Gamma(U_i, \mathcal{F}) \text{ s. th. } U_i \models \varphi(f_i) \\ U \models \forall \mathcal{F}. \varphi(\mathcal{F}) & :\iff \text{for all sheaves } \mathcal{F} \text{ on } V, V \subseteq U: V \models \varphi(\mathcal{F}) \\ U \models \exists \mathcal{F}. \varphi(\mathcal{F}) & :\iff \text{there exists a covering } U = \bigcup_i U_i \text{ s. th. for all } i: \\ & \quad \text{there exists a sheaf } \mathcal{F}_i \text{ on } U_i \text{ s. th. } U_i \models \varphi(\mathcal{F}_i) \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 2.2.* The last two rules, concerning *unbounded quantification*, are not part of the classical Kripke–Joyal semantics, but instead of Mike Shulman’s stack semantics [?], a slight extension. They are needed so that we can formulate universal properties in the internal language.

The rules are not all arbitrary. They are finely concerted to make the following propositions true, which are crucial for a proper appreciation of the internal language.

**Proposition 2.3** (Locality of the internal language). *Let  $U = \bigcup_i U_i$  be covered by open subsets. Let  $\varphi$  be a formula. Then*

$$U \models \varphi \quad \text{iff} \quad U_i \models \varphi \text{ for each } i.$$

*Proof.* Induction on the structure of  $\varphi$ . Note that the canceled rules would make this proposition false.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.4** (Soundness of the internal language). *If a formula  $\varphi$  implies a further formula  $\psi$  in intuitionistic logic, then*

$$U \models \varphi \quad \text{implies} \quad U \models \psi.$$

*Proof.* Proof by induction on the structure of formal intuitionistic proofs; we are to show that any inference rule of intuitionistic logic is satisfied by the Kripke–Joyal semantics. For instance, there is the following rule governing disjunction:

If  $\varphi \vee \psi$  holds, and both  $\varphi$  and  $\psi$  imply a further formula  $\chi$ , then  $\chi$  holds.

So we are to prove that if  $U \models \varphi \vee \psi$ ,  $U \models (\varphi \Rightarrow \chi)$ , and  $U \models (\psi \Rightarrow \chi)$ , then  $U \models \chi$ . This is done as follows: By assumption, there exists a covering  $U = \bigcup_i U_i$  such that on each  $U_i$ ,  $U_i \models \varphi$  or  $U_i \models \psi$ . Again by assumption, we may conclude that  $U_i \models \chi$  for each  $i$ . The statement follows because of the locality of the internal language.

A complete list of which rules are to prove is in [?, D1.3.1].  $\square$

- geometric formulas
- geometric constructions
- simplification rules
- notation:  $\text{Sh}(X) \models \varphi$  means  $X \models \varphi$
- remark: do not confuse  $\text{Sh}(X) \models \neg\varphi$  with  $\text{Sh}(X) \not\models \varphi$
- crash course on intuitionistic logic
- first steps: invertibility, nilpotency (needed later)

### 3. SHEAVES OF RINGS

**3.1. Reducedness.** Recall that a scheme  $X$  is *reduced* if and only if all stalks  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$  are reduced rings. Since the condition on a ring  $R$  to be reduced is a geometric implication,

$$\forall s : R. s^2 = 0 \implies s = 0,$$

we immediately obtain the following characterization of reducedness in the internal language:

**Proposition 3.1.** *A scheme  $X$  is reduced iff, from the internal point of view, the ring  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is reduced.*

**3.2. Locality.** Recall the usual definition of a local ring: a ring possessing exactly one maximal ideal. This is a higher-order condition and in particular not of a geometric form. Therefore, for our purposes, it's better to adopt the following elementary definition of a local ring.

**Definition 3.2.** A *local ring* is a ring  $R$  such that  $1 \neq 0$  in  $R$  and for all  $x, y \in R$

$$x + y \text{ invertible} \implies x \text{ invertible} \vee y \text{ invertible}.$$

In classical logic, it's an easy exercise to show that this definition is equivalent to the usual one. In intuitionistic logic, we would need to be more precise in order to even state the question of equivalence, since intuitionistically, the notion of a maximal ideal bifurcates into several non-equivalent notions.

**Proposition 3.3.** *In the internal language of a scheme  $X$  (or a locally ringed space), the ring  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is a local ring.*

*Proof.* The stated locality condition is a conjunction of two geometric implications (the first one being  $1 = 0 \Rightarrow \perp$ , the second being the displayed one) and holds on each stalk.  $\square$

**3.3. Field properties.** From the internal point of view, the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_X$  of a scheme  $X$  is *almost* a field, in the sense that any element which is not invertible is nilpotent. This is a genuine property of schemes, not shared with general locally ringed spaces.

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme. Then*

$$\text{Sh}(X) \models \forall s : \mathcal{O}_X. \neg(\ulcorner s \text{ invertible} \urcorner) \Rightarrow \ulcorner s \text{ nilpotent} \urcorner.$$

*Proof.* By the locality of the internal language and since  $X$  can be covered by open affine subsets, it's enough to show that for any affine scheme  $X = \text{Spec } A$  and global function  $s \in \Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = A$  it holds that

$$X \models \neg(\ulcorner s \text{ invertible} \urcorner) \quad \text{implies} \quad X \models \ulcorner s \text{ nilpotent} \urcorner.$$

The meaning of the antecedent is that any open subset on which  $s$  is invertible is empty. So in particular, the standard open subset  $D(s)$  is empty. Therefore  $s$  is an element of any prime ideal of  $A$  and thus nilpotent. This implies the a priori weaker statement  $X \models \ulcorner s \text{ nilpotent} \urcorner$  (which would allow  $s$  to have different indices of nilpotency on an open covering).  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme. If  $X$  is reduced, the ring  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is a field from the internal point of view, in the sense that*

$$\text{Sh}(X) \models \forall s : \mathcal{O}_X. \neg(\ulcorner s \text{ invertible} \urcorner) \Rightarrow s = 0.$$

*The converse holds as well.*

*Proof.* We can prove this purely in the internal language: It suffices to give an intuitionistic proof of the fact that a local ring which satisfies the condition of the previous proposition fulfills the stated field condition if and only if it is reduced. This is straightforward.  $\square$

This field property is very useful. We will put it to good use when giving a simple proof of the fact that  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules of finite type on a reduced scheme are locally free on a dense open subset (proposition ??).

- Remark that intuitionistically, the notion of a field bifurcates into several inequivalent notions
- discreteness

#### 4. SHEAVES OF MODULES

**4.1. Finite type, finite presentation, coherence.** Recall the conditions of an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  on a scheme  $X$  (or ringed space) to be of finite type, of finite presentation and to be coherent:

- $\mathcal{F}$  is of *finite type* if and only if there exists a covering of  $X$  by open subsets  $U$  such that on each such  $U$ , there exists an exact sequence

$$(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}|_U \longrightarrow 0$$

of  $\mathcal{O}_X|_U$ -modules.

- $\mathcal{F}$  is of *finite presentation* if and only if there exists a covering of  $X$  by open subsets  $U$  such that on each such  $U$ , there exists an exact sequence

$$(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^m \longrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^n \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}|_U \longrightarrow 0.$$

- $\mathcal{F}$  is *coherent* if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite type and the kernel of any  $\mathcal{O}_X|_U$ -linear morphism  $(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^n \rightarrow \mathcal{F}|_U$ ,  $U \subseteq X$  any open subset, is of finite type.

The following proposition gives translations of these definitions into the internal language.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme (or ringed locale). Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. Then:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite type if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$ , considered as an ordinary module from the internal perspective, is finitely generated, i. e. if

$$\mathrm{Sh}(X) \models \bigvee_{n \geq 0} \exists x_1, \dots, x_n : \mathcal{F}. \forall x : \mathcal{F}. \exists a_1, \dots, a_n : \mathcal{F}. x = \sum_i a_i x_i.$$

- (2)  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite presentation if and only if  $\mathcal{F}$  is a finitely presented module from the internal perspective, i. e. if ...  
 (3)  $\mathcal{F}$  is coherent if and only if ...

- of finite type, of finite presentation, coherent
- basic lemmas
- flatness
- important hard exercise
- torsion (check Liu p. 174)

## 5. UPPER SEMICONTINUOUS FUNCTIONS

**5.1. Interlude on natural numbers.** In classical logic, the natural numbers are complete in the sense that any inhabited set of natural numbers possesses a minimal element. This statement can not be proven intuitionistically – intuitively, this is because one cannot explicitly pinpoint the (classically existing) minimal element of an arbitrary inhabited set. In intuitionistic logic, this principle can be salvaged in two essentially different ways: either by strengthening the premise, or by weakening the conclusion.

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $U \subseteq \mathbb{N}$  be an inhabited subset of the natural numbers.*

- (1) *Assume  $U$  to be detachable, i. e. assume that for any natural number  $n$ , either  $n \in U$  or  $n \notin U$ . Then  $U$  possesses a minimal element.*  
 (2) *In any case,  $U$  does not not possess a minimal element.*

*Proof.* (1) By induction on the witness of inhabitation, i. e. the given number  $n$  such that  $n \in U$ . Details omitted, since we will not need this statement.  
 (2) We give a careful proof since logical subtleties matter. To simplify the exposition, we assume that  $U$  is upward-closed, i. e. that any number larger than some element of  $U$  lies in  $U$  as well. Any subset can be closed in this way (by considering  $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists m \in U. n \geq m\}$ ) and a minimal element of the closure will be a minimal element for  $U$  as well.

We induct on the number  $n \in U$  given by the assumption that  $U$  is inhabited. In the case  $n = 0$  we are done since 0 is a minimal element of  $U$ . For the induction step  $n \rightarrow n + 1$ , the weak law of excluded middle gives

$$\neg \neg (n \in U \vee n \notin U).$$

If we can show that  $n \in U \vee n \notin U$  implies the conclusion, we're done by XXX. So assume  $n \in U \vee n \notin U$ . If  $n \in U$ , then  $U$  does not not possess a minimal element by the induction hypothesis. If  $n \notin U$ , then  $n + 1$  is a minimal element (and so, in particular,  $U$  does not not possess a minimal element): For if  $m$  is any element of  $U$ , we have  $m \geq n + 1$  or  $m \leq n$ . In the first case, we're done. In the second case, it follows that  $n \in U$  because  $U$  is upward-closed and so we obtain a contradiction. From this contradiction we can deduce  $m \geq n + 1$ .  $\square$

If we want to work with a complete set of natural numbers in intuitionistic logic, we have to construction a completion.

**Definition 5.2.** The partially ordered set of *completed natural numbers* is the set  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  of all inhabited upward-closed subsets of  $\mathbb{N}$ , ordered by reverse inclusion.

**Lemma 5.3.** *The poset of completed natural numbers is the least partially ordered set containing  $\mathbb{N}$  and possessing minima of arbitrary inhabited subsets.*

*Proof.* The embedding  $\mathbb{N} \hookrightarrow \widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  is given by

$$n \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \uparrow(n) := \{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid m \geq n\}.$$

If  $M \subseteq \widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  is an inhabited subset, its minimum is

$$\min M = \bigcup_{M \in \widehat{\mathbb{N}}} M.$$

The proof of the universal property is left to the reader.  $\square$

*Remark 5.4.* In classical logic, the map  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ ,  $U \mapsto \min U$  is a well-defined isomorphism of partially ordered sets.

**5.2. A geometric interpretation.** We are interested in the completed natural numbers for the following reason: A completed natural number of the topos of sheaves on a topological space  $X$  is the same as an upper semicontinuous function  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Let  $X$  be a topological space. The sheaf  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  of completed natural numbers on  $X$  is canonically isomorphic to the sheaf of upper semicontinuous  $\mathbb{N}$ -valued functions on  $X$ .*

*Proof.* When referring to the natural numbers in the internal language, we actually refer to the constant sheaf  $\underline{\mathbb{N}}$  on  $X$ . (This is because the sheaf  $\underline{\mathbb{N}}$  fulfills the axioms of a natural numbers object, cf. [?, XXX].) Recall that its sections on an open subset  $U \subseteq X$  are continuous functions  $U \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mathbb{N}$  is equipped with the discrete topology.

Therefore, a section of  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  on an open subset  $U \subseteq X$  is given by a subsheaf  $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \underline{\mathbb{N}}|_U$  such that

$$U \models \exists n : \underline{\mathbb{N}}. n \in \mathcal{A} \quad \text{and} \quad U \models \forall n, m : \underline{\mathbb{N}}. n \geq m \wedge n \in \mathcal{A} \Rightarrow m \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Since these conditions are geometric, they are satisfied if and only if any stalk  $\mathcal{A}_x$  is an inhabited upward-closed subset of  $\underline{\mathbb{N}}_x \cong \mathbb{N}$ . The association

$$x \in X \mapsto \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \in \mathcal{A}_x\}$$

thus defines a map  $X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ . This map is indeed upper semicontinuous, since if  $n \in \mathcal{A}_x$ , there exists a neighbourhood  $V$  of  $x$  such that the constant function with value  $n$  is an element of  $\Gamma(V, \mathcal{A})$  and therefore  $n \in \mathcal{A}_y$  for all  $y \in V$ .

Conversely, let  $\alpha : X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  be an upper semi-continuous function. Then

$$V \subseteq X \mapsto \{f : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \mid f \text{ continuous, } f \geq \alpha \text{ on } V\}$$

is a subobject of  $\underline{\mathbb{N}}|_U$  which internally is inhabited and upward-closed. Further details are left to the reader.  $\square$

Under the correspondence given by the lemma, locally *constant* functions map exactly to the (image of the) *ordinary* internal natural numbers (in the completed natural numbers).

*Remark 5.6.* In a similar vein, the sheaf given by the internal construction of the set of *all* upward-closed subsets of the natural numbers (not only the inhabited ones) is canonically isomorphic to the sheaf of upper semicontinuous functions with values in  $\mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$ .

**5.3. The upper semicontinuous rank function.** Recall that the rank of an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  on a scheme  $X$  (or locally ringed space) at a point  $x \in X$  is defined as the  $k(x)$ -dimension of the vector space  $\mathcal{F}_x \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{X,x}} k(x)$ . If we assume that  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite type around  $x$ , this dimension is finite and equals the minimal number of elements needed to generate  $\mathcal{F}_x$  as an  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ -module (by Nakayama's lemma).

In the internal language, we can define an element of  $\widehat{\mathbb{N}}$  by

$$\text{rank } \mathcal{F} := \min\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \ulcorner \text{there is a gen. family for } \mathcal{F} \text{ consisting of } n \text{ elements} \urcorner\} \in \widehat{\mathbb{N}}.$$

If  $\mathcal{F}$  is locally finitely free, it will be a finitely free module from the internal point of view and the rank defined in this way will be an actual natural number; but in general, the rank is really an element of the completion.

**Proposition 5.7.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module of finite type on a scheme  $X$  (or locally ringed space). Under the correspondence given by the previous lemma, the internally defined rank maps to the rank function of  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof.* We have to show that for any point  $x \in X$  and natural number  $n$ , there exists a generating family for  $\mathcal{F}_x$  consisting of  $n$  elements if and only if there exists a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $x$  such that

$$U \models \ulcorner \text{there exists a generating family for } \mathcal{F} \text{ consisting of } n \text{ elements} \urcorner.$$

The “if” direction is obvious. For the “only if” direction, consider (liftings to local sections of a) generating family  $s_1, \dots, s_n$  of  $\mathcal{F}_x$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is of finite type, there also exist sections  $t_1, \dots, t_m$  on some neighbourhood  $V$  of  $x$  which generate any stalk  $\mathcal{F}_y$ ,  $y \in V$ . Since the  $t_i$  can be expressed as a linear combination of the  $s_j$  in  $\mathcal{F}_x$ , the same is true on some open neighbourhood  $U \subseteq V$  of  $x$ . On this neighbourhood, the  $s_j$  generate any stalk  $\mathcal{F}_y$ ,  $y \in U$ , so we have

$$U \models \ulcorner s_1, \dots, s_n \text{ generate } \mathcal{F} \urcorner. \quad \square$$

*Remark 5.8.* Once we understand when properties holding at a stalk spread to a neighbourhood, we will be able to give a simpler proof of the proposition (see XXX).

## 6. RATIONAL FUNCTIONS AND CARTIER DIVISORS

**6.1. The sheaf of rational functions.** Recall that the sheaf  $\mathcal{K}_X$  of rational functions on a scheme  $X$  (or ringed space) can be defined as the sheaf associated to the presheaf

$$U \subseteq X \longmapsto \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)[\Gamma(U, \mathcal{S})^{-1}],$$

where  $\Gamma(U, \mathcal{S})$  is the multiplicative set of those sections of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  on  $U$ , which are regular in each stalk  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ ,  $x \in U$ . Recall also there are some wrong definitions in the literature [?].

Using the internal language, we can give a simpler definition of  $\mathcal{K}_X$ . Recall that we can associate to any ring  $R$  its total quotient ring, i.e. its localization at the multiplicative subset of regular elements. Since from the internal perspective  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is

an ordinary ring, we can associate to it its total quotient ring  $\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is internally defined by the formula

$$\mathcal{S} := \{s : \mathcal{O}_X \mid \ulcorner s \text{ is regular} \urcorner\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X.$$

Externally, this ring is the sheaf  $\mathcal{K}_X$ .

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme (or a ringed space). The sheaf of rings defined in the internal language by localizing  $\mathcal{O}_X$  at its set of regular elements is (canonically isomorphic to) the sheaf  $\mathcal{K}_X$  of rational functions.*

*Proof.* Internally, the ring  $\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]$  fulfills the following universal property: For any ring  $R$  and any homomorphism  $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow R$  which maps the elements of  $\mathcal{S}$  to units, there exists exactly one homomorphism  $\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{S}^{-1}] \rightarrow R$  which makes the evident diagram commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & R \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{S}^{-1}] & \end{array}$$

The translation using the Kripke–Joyal semantics gives the following universal property: For any open subset  $U \subseteq X$ , any sheaf of rings  $\mathcal{R}$  and any homomorphism  $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  which maps all elements of  $\Gamma(V, \mathcal{S})$ ,  $V \subseteq U$  to units, there exists exactly one homomorphism  $\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{S}^{-1}] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  which makes the evident diagram commute. It is well-known [?] that the sheaf  $\mathcal{K}_X$  as usually defined satisfies this universal property as well.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.2.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme (or ringed space). Then the stalks of  $\mathcal{K}_X$  are given by*

$$\mathcal{K}_{X,x} = \mathcal{O}_{X,x}[\mathcal{S}_x^{-1}].$$

*The elements of  $\mathcal{S}_x$  are exactly the germs of those local sections which are regular not only in  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ , but in all rings  $\mathcal{O}_{X,y}$  where  $y$  ranges over some neighbourhood of  $x$  (depending on the section).*

*Proof.* Since localization is a geometric construction, the first statement is entirely trivial. The second statement follows since

$$\Gamma(U, \mathcal{S}) = \{s \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X) \mid U \models \ulcorner s \text{ is regular} \urcorner\}$$

and regularity is a geometric implication, so that  $U \models \ulcorner s \text{ is regular} \urcorner$  if and only iff the germ  $s_y$  is regular in  $\mathcal{O}_{X,y}$  for all  $y \in U$ .  $\square$

**6.2. Regularity of local functions.** It is well known that on a locally Noetherian scheme, regularity spreads from stalks to neighbourhoods, i. e. a section of  $\mathcal{O}_X$  is regular in  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$  if and only if it is regular on some neighbourhood of  $x$ . This fact has a simple proof in the internal language:

**Proposition 6.3.** *Let  $X$  be a locally Noetherian scheme. Let  $s \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$  be a local function on  $X$ . Let  $x \in U$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) *The section  $s$  is regular in  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ .*
- (2) *The section  $s$  is regular in all local rings  $\mathcal{O}_{X,y}$  where  $y$  ranges over some neighbourhood of  $x$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Box$  be the modal operator defined by  $\Box(\varphi) := ((\varphi \Rightarrow !x) \Rightarrow !x)$ . By XXX, we are to show that the following statements of the internal language are equivalent:



- (1)  $(\ulcorner s \text{ is regular} \urcorner)^\square$ , i. e.  $\forall t : \mathcal{O}_X. st = 0 \Rightarrow \square(t = 0)$ .
- (2)  $\square(\ulcorner s \text{ is regular} \urcorner)$ , i. e.  $\square(\forall t : \mathcal{O}_X. st = 0 \Rightarrow t = 0)$ .

It is clear that the second statement implies the first – in fact, this is true without any assumptions on  $X$ : Let  $t : \mathcal{O}_X$  be such that  $st = 0$ . Since we want to prove the boxed statement  $\square(t = 0)$ , we may assume that  $s$  is regular and prove  $t = 0$ . This follows by definition.

For the converse direction, consider the annihilator of  $s$ , i. e. the ideal

$$I := \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(s) = \{t : \mathcal{O}_X \mid st = 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X.$$

This ideal satisfies the quasicoherece condition (proposition XXX): Let  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$  be arbitrary and assume  $\ulcorner f \text{ inv.} \urcorner \Rightarrow t \in I$ . By XXX (here the assumption that  $X$  is a scheme enters) it follows that  $f^n st = 0$  for some  $n : \mathbb{N}$ , i. e. that  $f^n t \in I$ .

Thus  $I$  is a quasicoherece submodule of a finitely generated module. Since  $X$  is locally Noetherian, it follows that  $I$  is finitely generated as well. By assumption, each generator  $x_i \in I$  fulfills  $\square(x_i = 0)$ . Since we want to prove a boxed statement, we may in fact assume  $x_i = 0$ . Thus  $I = (0)$  and the assertion, that  $s$  is regular, follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let  $X$  be a locally Noetherian scheme. Then the stalks  $\mathcal{K}_{X,x}$  of the sheaf of rational functions are given by the total quotient rings of the local rings  $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ .*

### 6.3. Geometric interpretation of the sheaf of rational functions.

- on reduced schemes,  $\mathcal{K}_X$  is the sheaf of meromorphic functions
- show  $\mathcal{K}_X = j_*(\mathcal{O}_X)^\times$ ?
- internal definition of Cartier divisors
- correspondence between Cartier divisors and sub- $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules of  $\mathcal{K}_X$

## 7. RELATIVE SPECTRUM

- ...

## 8. MODALITIES

- negneg
- spreading of properties from stalk to neighbourhood
- internal sheafification

## 9. QUASICOHERENT SHEAVES OF MODULES

Recall that an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  on a ringed space  $X$  is *quasicoherece* if and only if there exists a covering of  $X$  by open subsets  $U$  such that on each such  $U$ , there exists an exact sequence

$$(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^J \longrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^I \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}|_U \longrightarrow 0$$

of  $\mathcal{O}_X|_U$ -modules, where  $I$  and  $J$  are arbitrary sets (which may depend on  $U$ ). If  $X$  is indeed a scheme, quasicoherece can also be characterized in terms of inclusions of distinguished open subsets of affines: An  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  is quasicoherece if and only if for any open affine subscheme  $U = \text{Spec } A$  of  $X$  and any function  $f \in A$ , the canonical map

$$\Gamma(U, \mathcal{F})[f^{-1}] \longrightarrow \Gamma(D(f), \mathcal{F}), \quad \frac{s}{f^n} \longmapsto f^{-n}s|_{D(f)}$$

is an isomorphism of  $A[f^{-1}]$ -modules. Here  $D(f) \subseteq U$  denotes the standard open subset  $\{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } A \mid f \notin \mathfrak{p}\}$ . Both conditions can be internalized.

**Proposition 9.1.** *Let  $X$  be a ringed space. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is quasicoherent if and only if*

$$\text{Sh}(X) \models \exists I, J \text{ lc. } \ulcorner \text{there exists an exact sequence } \mathcal{O}_X^I \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X^J \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0 \urcorner.$$

The “lc” indicates that when interpreting this internal statement with the Kripke–Joyal semantics,  $I$  and  $J$  should only be instantiated with locally constant sheaves.

*Proof.* We only sketch the proof. The translation of the internal statement is that there exists a covering of  $X$  by open subsets  $U$  such that for each such  $U$ , there exist sets  $I, J$  and an exact sequence

$$(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^{\underline{J}} \longrightarrow (\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^{\underline{I}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{F}|_U \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $\underline{I}$  and  $\underline{J}$  are the constant sheaves associated to  $I$  respectively  $J$ . The term “ $(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^{\underline{I}}$ ” refers to the internally defined free  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module with basis the elements of  $\underline{I}$ . By exploiting that  $\underline{I}$  is a discrete set from the internal point of view (i.e. any two elements are either equal or not), one can show that this is the same as  $(\mathcal{O}_X|_U)^I$ ; similarly for  $J$ . With this observation, the statement follows.  $\square$

In practice, the internal condition given by the proposition is not very useful, since at the moment, we do not know of any internal characterization of locally constant sheaves. The internal condition given by the following proposition does not have this defect.

**Proposition 9.2.** *Let  $X$  be scheme. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. Then  $\mathcal{F}$  is quasicoherent if and only if, from the internal perspective, the localized module  $\mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$  is a sheaf for the modal operator  $(\ulcorner f \text{ inv. } \urcorner \Rightarrow \_)$  for any  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$ .*

In detail, the internal condition is that for any  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$ , it holds that

$$\forall s : \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]. (\ulcorner f \text{ inv. } \urcorner \Rightarrow s = 0) \Longrightarrow s = 0$$

and for any subsingleton  $S \subseteq \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$  it holds that

$$(\ulcorner f \text{ inv. } \urcorner \Rightarrow \ulcorner S \text{ inhabited } \urcorner) \Longrightarrow \exists s : \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]. (\ulcorner f \text{ inv. } \urcorner \Rightarrow s \in S).$$

Unlike with the internalizations of finite type, finite presentation and coherence, this condition is *not* a standard condition of commutative algebra. In fact, in classical logic, this condition is always satisfied – for trivial logical reasons if  $f$  is invertible and because  $\mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$  is the zero module if  $f$  is not invertible (since then, it’s nilpotent). This is to be expected: *Any* module  $M$  in commutative algebra is quasicoherent in the sense that the associated sheaf of modules  $M^\sim$  is quasicoherent.

The proof will explain the origin of this condition.

*Proof of proposition 9.2. ...*  $\square$

**Corollary 9.3.** *Let  $X$  be a scheme. Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be a quasicoherent  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -module. Let  $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$  be a submodule. Then  $\mathcal{G}$  is quasicoherent if and only if*

$$\text{Sh}(X) \models \forall f : \mathcal{O}_X. \forall s : \mathcal{F}. (\ulcorner f \text{ inv. } \urcorner \Rightarrow s \in \mathcal{G}) \Longrightarrow \bigvee_{n \geq 0} f^n s \in \mathcal{G}.$$

*Proof.* We can give a purely internal proof. Let  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$ . Since subpresheaves of separated sheaves are separated, the module  $\mathcal{G}[f^{-1}]$  is in any case separated with respect to the modal operator ( $\ulcorner f \text{ inv.} \urcorner \Rightarrow \_$ ).

Now suppose that  $\mathcal{G}$  is quasicoherent. Let  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$ . Let  $s : \mathcal{F}$  and assume that if  $f$  were invertible,  $s$  would be an element of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Define the subsingleton  $S := \{t : \mathcal{G}[f^{-1}] \mid \ulcorner f \text{ inv.} \urcorner \wedge t = s/1\}$ . Then  $S$  would be inhabited by  $s/1$  if  $f$  were invertible. Since  $\mathcal{G}[f^{-1}]$  is a sheaf, it follows that there exists an element  $u/f^n$  of  $\mathcal{G}[f^{-1}]$  such that, if  $f$  were invertible, it would be the case that  $u/f^n = s/1 \in \mathcal{G}[f^{-1}] \subseteq \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$  is separated, it follows that it actually holds that  $u/f^n = s/1 \in \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$ . Therefore there exists  $m : \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f^m f^n s = f^m u \in \mathcal{F}$ . Thus  $f^{m+n} s$  is an element of  $\mathcal{G}$ .

For the converse direction, assume that  $\mathcal{G}$  fulfills the stated condition. Let  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$ . Let  $S \subseteq \mathcal{G}[f^{-1}]$  be a subsingleton which would be inhabited if  $f$  were invertible. By regarding  $S$  as a subset of  $\mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$ , it follows that there exists an element  $u/f^n \in \mathcal{F}[f^{-1}]$  such that, if  $f$  were invertible,  $u/f^n$  would be an element of  $S$ . In particular,  $u$  would be an element of  $\mathcal{G}$ . By assumption it follows that there exists  $m : \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f^m u \in \mathcal{G}$ . Thus  $(f^m u)/(f^m f^n)$  is an element of  $\mathcal{G}[f^{-1}]$  such that, if  $f$  were invertible, it would be an element of  $S$ .  $\square$

**Example 9.4.** Let  $X$  be a scheme and  $s$  be a global section of  $\mathcal{O}_X$ . Then the annihilator of  $s$ , i.e. the sheaf of ideals internally defined by the formula

$$I := \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(s) = \{t : \mathcal{O}_X \mid st = 0\} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$$

is quasicoherent. To prove this in the internal language, it suffices to verify the condition of the proposition. So let  $f : \mathcal{O}_X$  be arbitrary and assume  $\ulcorner f \text{ inv.} \urcorner \Rightarrow t \in I$ , i.e. assume that if  $f$  were invertible,  $st$  would be zero. By XXX it follows that  $f^n st = 0$  for some  $n : \mathbb{N}$ , i.e. that  $f^n t \in I$ .

- is the condition good enough to show that modules of finite type are quasicoherent?
- discussion meaning of the sheaf condition in external language
- give more examples:  $\sqrt{(0)}$ ,  $(h)$ , ...
- Noetherian hypotheses: for example, that any quasicoherent submodule of a module of finite type is of finite type as well

## 10. UNSORTED

- “functoriality”
- Kähler differentials
- closed and open subschemes
- reduced closed subscheme
- Koszul resolution
- meta properties, uses (e.g. nilpotent on stalks iff globally nilpotent, some lemmas about limits of modules)
- locally small categories
- big Zariski topos
- open/closed immersions
- morphisms of schemes...
- proper maps...
- limits and colimits...

- related work: Mulvey/Burden, Wraith, Vickers, the Bohr topos crew, Awodey, ...

*E-mail address:* `iblech@web.de`