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* Schemes $=$ quasi-compact, quasi-separated schemes of finite type
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Axiom: We have a local, commutative ring $R$.
For a finitely presented $R$-algebra $A$, define:

$$
\operatorname{Spec}(A): \equiv \operatorname{Hom}_{R \text {-algebra }}(A, R)
$$

Axiom (synthetic quasi-coherence (SQC)):
For any finitely presented $R$-algebra $A$, the map

$$
a \mapsto(\varphi \mapsto \varphi(a)): A \xrightarrow{\sim} R^{\operatorname{Spec}(A)}
$$

is an equivalence.
Example: $\operatorname{Spec}(R[X])=R$. Thus:

$$
R[X] \xrightarrow{\sim} R^{R}
$$

polynomials $=$ functions !!
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For $A=R$, we get open propositions:
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\text { OpenProp }: \equiv\left\{\left(r_{1} \text { inv. }\right) \vee \ldots \vee\left(r_{n} \text { inv. }\right) \mid r_{i}: R\right\}
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Lemma: There is an embedding:

$$
\left\{D\left(f_{1}\right) \cup \cdots \cup D\left(f_{n}\right) \mid f_{i}: A\right\} \quad \hookrightarrow \quad \text { OpenProp }{ }^{\operatorname{Spec}(A)}
$$

But is it an equivalence??
Yes, using Zariski-local choice!

## Zariski-local choice

## Axiom (Zariski-local choice):

For every surjective $\pi$, there merely exist local sections $s_{i}$

with $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}: A$ coprime.
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$>$ OpenProp $^{\operatorname{Spec}(A)} \cong\{$ f.g. radical ideals of $A\}$
$\checkmark$ OpenProp is closed under $\Sigma$-types.

- All functions Spec $A \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ are bounded.

The type of schemes is closed under $\Sigma$-types.
For $A: X \rightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$, define cohomology as:

$$
H^{n}(X, A): \equiv\left\|\prod_{x: X} K\left(A_{x}, n\right)\right\|_{\mathrm{set}}
$$

- $H^{n}$ coincides with Čech-Cohomology (for separated schemes).

A scheme $X$ is affine if and only if

$$
H^{n}(X, M)=0
$$

for all $M: X \rightarrow R-\operatorname{Mod}_{\text {wqc }}$ and $n>0$.

Thank you!
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Let $X$ be a type and $\mathcal{F}: X \rightarrow \mathrm{Ab}$ a dependent abelian group on $X$.
The $n$-th cohomology group of $\mathcal{F}$ is

$$
H^{n}(X, \mathcal{F}): \equiv\left\|\prod_{x: X} K\left(\mathcal{F}_{x}, n\right)\right\|_{0}
$$

Properties:
The $H^{n}(X, \mathcal{F})$ are all abelian groups.
Functoriality, covariant in $\mathcal{F}$, contravariant in $X$.
Some long exact sequence for coefficients.
We have a Mayer-Vietoris-Lemma and more generally correspondence with Čech-Cohomology, for nice enough spaces.

## Zariski-Choice and Cohomology
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Let $X=\operatorname{Spec}(A)$ and $M: X \rightarrow R$-Mod such that $\left((x: D(f)) \rightarrow M_{x}\right)=((x: X) \rightarrow M)_{f}$, then
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H^{1}(X, M)=0
$$

Proof: Let $|T|: H^{1}(X, M) \equiv\left\|(x: X) \rightarrow K\left(M_{x}, 1\right)\right\|_{0}$ and from that $(x: X) \rightarrow\left\|T_{x}=M_{x}\right\|$. Our third axiom, Zariski-local choice, merely gives us coprime $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{n}: A$, such that for each $i$ we have

$$
s_{i}:\left(x: D\left(f_{i}\right)\right) \rightarrow T_{x}=M_{x} .
$$

So for $t_{i j}(x): \equiv s_{j}(x)^{-1} \cdot s_{i}(x)$ we have $t_{i j}+t_{j k}=t_{i k}$. By algebra, we get $u_{i}:\left(x: D\left(f_{i}\right)\right) \rightarrow M_{x}$ with $t_{i j}=u_{i}-u_{j}$. Then the $\tilde{s}_{i}: \equiv s_{i}-u_{i}$ glues to a global trivialization.

