

Univalent Foundations of Constructive Algebraic Geometry

Max Zeuner

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, STOCKHOLM UNIVERSITY

zeuner@math.su.se

July 25, 2024

Abstract

We investigate two constructive approaches to defining quasi-compact and quasi-separated schemes (qcqs-schemes), namely qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices and as functors from rings to sets. We work in Homotopy Type Theory and Univalent Foundations, but reason informally. The main result is a constructive and univalent proof that the two definitions coincide, giving an equivalence between the respective categories of qcqs-schemes.

Acknowledgments The author would like to thank Thierry Coquand for suggesting this project and for his invaluable input and feedback. Further thanks go to Anders Mörtberg for his supervision and to Felix Cherubini and Matthias Hutzler for being an integral part of the project.

1 Introduction

Since its inception by Grothendieck and his school in the latter half of the 20th century, the notion of scheme has found important applications in various fields of mathematics ranging from geometry to number theory. Arguably, it has led to some of the most staggering mathematical achievements in recent history. In spite of being a rather abstract notion that relies heavily on modern set-theoretic machinery, the motivations for studying schemes coming from classic algebraic geometry have a rather hands-on computational character: studying the solutions to finite systems of polynomial equations. Giving a satisfying constructive definition of schemes and determining the computational content of scheme theory, is thus an important problem for the program of constructive mathematics.

In this task, the constructive mathematician is confronted with two options: Constructivizing the topological notion of scheme as a locally ringed space or the categorical notion of scheme as a “functor of points”. At first glance, categorical/functorial schemes seem more appropriate for constructive study, as topological spaces are an inherently problematic notion from a constructive point of view. The categorical approach was actually the preferred one of Grothendieck himself [GG74]. Furthermore, all of the basic notions of the functorial approach, as e.g. defined in the textbook “Introduction to algebraic geometry and algebraic groups” By Demazure and Gabriel [DG80], are constructively valid. Moreover, the functorial schemes embed into a sheaf topos, the so-called *big Zariski topos* and in the internal language of this topos, which is constructive, one can develop algebraic geometry synthetically. This line of work was pioneered by Kock [Koc76] and is studied extensively in the thesis of Blechschmidt [Ble21]. The synthetic approach has also been studied using Homotopy Type Theory and Univalent Foundations by Cherubini, Coquand and Hutzler [CCH23].

As its name suggests, however, the big Zariski topos cannot be defined rigorously without introducing size issues, which arise already when working classically. Demazure and Gabriel assume *two* Grothendieck universes for precisely this reason [DG80]. More modern sources usually tend to ignore size issues or leave “the appropriate modifications” to resolve these issues “to the interested reader” [Jan87]. Of course, the size issues become even more pressing in a constructive, predicative setting. Blechschmidt’s thesis contains an insightful discussion [Ble21, Sec. 16.5], highlighting that it is possible to work in an entirely constructive and predicative set-up for synthetic algebraic geometry, by restricting oneself to *finitely presented* algebras over some base ring R . One can then define *schemes of finite presentation over $\text{Spec}(R)$* in a purely functorial way that corresponds to a well-behaved internal definition of “finitely presented synthetic schemes” [Ble21, Def. 19.49].

In this context it is noteworthy that all *quasi-compact and quasi separated* schemes (qcqs-schemes) can be defined constructively and predicatively. These qcqs-schemes contain all schemes of finite presentation and need not be defined over some affine base scheme. This is achieved through a careful point-free reformulation of the topological approach. Initiated in a series of papers by Schuster [Sch03, Sch06, Sch08] using formal topology, this approach was subsequently refined by Coquand, Lombardi and Schuster [CLS07, CLS09] using lattices. The main observation is that, since qcqs-schemes are always a coherent or spectral space, it is sufficient to consider the distributive lattice of quasi-compact opens and the structure sheaf restricted to this lattice. Instead of locally ringed spaces, qcqs-schemes are defined as ringed lattices in [CLS09].

In this paper we want to establish a common constructive framework for the functorial and the lattice-theoretic approach. Classically, to each locally ringed space X one can associate a sheaf in the big Zariski topos called the functor of points of X . This is the construction that most textbooks use, when developing

the functorial approach from the standard classical approach.¹ Modulo size issues, this functor of points construction has a left adjoint and when restricted schemes this adjunction becomes an equivalence of categories. This result is called the *comparison theorem* in [DG80, Ch. I, §1, no 4.4] and the main result of this paper is a constructive version of this result for qcqs-schemes and schemes of finite presentation.

The main obstacle are not the size issues, but the circumstance that qcqs-schemes in [CLS09] are defined as ringed lattices, while the functor of points construction requires a *locally* ringed space. What is needed are notions of *locally ringed lattices* and their *morphisms*, such that a morphism of qcqs-schemes (in the sense of [CLS09]) is just a morphism of locally ringed lattices. In [CLS09], the study of such notions is omitted on purpose. The authors argue that the paper shows that

“up to a certain point one can get by on without any talk of locally ringed lattices and their morphisms, concepts which seem relatively involved if compared with the ones given in this paper.”

Yet, they do conclude that the study of locally ringed lattices is central to a fully constructive foundation of algebraic geometry. In this paper we want to fill this gap and provide an in-depth discussion of locally ringed lattices and their morphisms. This is not just a means to the end of obtaining a constructive comparison theorem. We want to show that qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices actually admit a rather neat presentation.

The basics of the constructive approach to functorial qcqs-schemes that we use in this paper have actually been formalized in the `Cubical Agda` [ZH24]. The size issues are tackled by using enough type-theoretic universes. As `Cubical Agda` is an extension of the `Agda` proof assistant supporting Homotopy Type Theory and Univalent Foundations (HoTT/UF), these universes are univalent. We use HoTT/UF as the foundation for this work as well and make crucial use of univalence. This choice of foundation for (constructive) algebraic geometry is further motivated by a `Cubical Agda` formalization of the structure sheaf of an affine scheme [ZM23], suggesting that the structuralist approach to mathematics of the Grothendieck school can be emulated more faithfully using univalence. Generally, HoTT/UF is not only a foundation for “higher” mathematics and synthetic homotopy theory. The internal notions of sets and propositions provide a natural framework for set-level constructive mathematics with convenient features like quotients. In the particular case of the constructive comparison theorem, univalent type-theoretic universes let us circumvent size issues and actually strengthen the main result.

This paper tries to strike a delicate balance between conceptual clarity and formal rigor. On the one hand, many of the insights presented in the paper do not actually depend on the choice of foundation and we do not want to

¹See e.g. [EH06].

bury them under technicalities. On the other hand, with important parts of constructive scheme theory already formalized in the univalent `Cubical Agda` proof assistant [ZM23, ZH24], this paper aims to serve as a sort of blue-print for formalized univalent and constructive algebraic geometry in the tradition of Voevodsky’s Foundations library [Voe15]. The paper is structured as follows:

- In Section 2 we give some of the necessary background. We comment on our use of HoTT/UF and provide some guidance for readers not familiar with type theory or univalence. We also introduce the so-called Zariski lattice of a commutative ring. This construction has been studied extensively in point-free topology and constructive algebra and will play an important role throughout this paper.
- In Section 3 we introduce the notion of a locally ringed lattice, building on an idea of Coquand. We show that the Zariski lattice of a commutative ring R together with its structure sheaf is a locally ringed lattice, which can be regarded as the constructive spectrum of R . We give a simple proof that the thus induced spectrum functor is adjoint to the global sections functor. We define qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices and show that scheme morphisms as defined in [CLS09] are just morphisms of locally ringed lattices. We finish the section discussing why schemes defined as locally ringed lattices coincide with classical qcqs-schemes.
- In Section 4 we describe the functor of points approach to qcqs-schemes. We build on the `Cubical Agda` formalization described in [ZH24], but provide strengthened results. We define \mathbb{Z} -functors, i.e. functors from rings to sets, and the Zariski coverage on \mathbb{Z} -functors. We introduce compact open subfunctors as subobjects of \mathbb{Z} -functors that are classified by the Zariski lattice and use these to define functorial qcqs-schemes. We prove that compact open subfunctors of functorial qcqs-schemes are qcqs-schemes.
- In Section 5 we prove a “comparison theorem” for the two notions of qcqs-schemes given in this paper. The proof can be seen as an adaption of the comparison theorem of Demazure and Gabriel to HoTT/UF, making some of the steps more explicit and precise. We define the functor of points of a locally ringed lattice and the realization of a \mathbb{Z} -functor as a locally ringed lattice. We show that these functors are adjoint modulo size issues and that on (functorial) qcqs-schemes both functors become fully faithful. With the help of univalence, we can ignore size issues and obtain an equivalence of the respective categories of qcqs-schemes.
- In Section 6 we give an outline of how to adapt the above results to schemes of finite presentation over some base ring R , without having to deal with size issues. The classical definition is adapted to locally ringed lattices and for functorial schemes of finite presentation we use Blechschmidt’s

parsimonious site of finitely presented R -functors [Ble21, Sec. 16.5]. We indicate why in this setting the proof of the comparison theorem not only still goes through, but can actually be simplified.

2 Background

This paper aims to give a self-contained introduction to the constructive theory of schemes from the univalent point of view. Familiarity with classical algebraic geometry and schemes as e.g. introduced in Hartshorne’s classic “Algebraic Geometry” [Har13] is not strictly required, although certainly helpful to gain an intuition for the notions introduced in this paper and for understanding the motivations to study these notions in the first place. An exception is Section 3.4, where we compare our definition using locally ringed lattices to the classical one. What is assumed as a prerequisite, however, is some commutative algebra including the basic theory of ideals and localizations of commutative rings, i.e. rings of fractions.² On top of that we will also assume knowledge of category theory, in particular familiarity with (co-) limits, adjunctions, presheaves, the Yoneda lemma and Kan extensions.³

2.1 Univalent foundations

We work in HoTT/UF and all definitions and results are written in the informal (or rather semi-formal) style of the “HoTT-book” [Uni13]. The paper aims to present the key definitions and ideas with only a modicum of type-theoretic notation that we quickly want to recapitulate here. For understanding the details of this paper and the relation to the `Cubical Agda` formalizations [ZM23, ZH24], acquaintance with HoTT/UF is required.⁴ The notation largely follows the conventions of the HoTT-book [Uni13], with some exceptions inspired by the syntax of the `Agda` proof assistant. We are first and foremost concerned with types and their terms rather than sets and their elements and thus write $x : A$ to denote that x is of type A , instead of $x \in A$. Note that this is a stipulation, like introducing a new variable, rather than a provable statement. In particular, there is no general type-theoretic equivalent to $x \notin A$.

HoTT/UF is most commonly described as an extension of Martin-Löf’s *dependent type theory* (MLTT) [ML75]. For our purposes, we actually only need rather few additions to MLTT namely, the univalence axiom and set-quotients, which can then be used to define propositional truncations. For a type A , a

²These prerequisites are covered e.g. in the first three chapters of “Introduction to Commutative Algebra” by Atiyah and MacDonald [AM69].

³This is covered in e.g. chapters I-V and X of Mac Lane’s “Categories for the working mathematician” [ML13] or Riehl’s “Category Theory in Context” [Rie17].

⁴This roughly amounts to the material covered in first three chapters of the HoTT-book together with some additional topics like set-quotients, truncations and of course the consequences of univalence.

dependent type B over A can be seen as a family of types $B(a)$ for $a : A$. The type of *dependent functions* $(a : A) \rightarrow B(a)$ is the type of functions f that take an input $a : A$ and return an output $f(a) : B(a)$, i.e. functions that vary in their codomain depending on the input. Note that we are using `Agda`-syntax for dependent functions rather than Π -types in order to avoid confusion with products. The Σ -type or type of *dependent pairs* $\Sigma_{a:A} B(a)$ is the type of pairs (a, b) such that $a : A$ and $b : B(a)$, i.e. pairs where the type of the second component depends on the first component. These are incredibly useful to define complex structures. However, we will mostly introduce new structures informally and avoid writing Σ -types in order to increase readability.

Martin-Löf type theory has two notions of equality. Definitional equality, which we will denote by \equiv , is a stipulated equality that cannot be (dis-) proven. We follow the HoTT-book and write $:\equiv$ for definitional equalities that introduce new objects or notation. On top of that there are *identity types*. For $x, y : A$, we may think of the type $x = y$ as the type of proofs that x equals y . Identity types can be rather complex objects in HoTT/UF, but they let us define the notions of set and proposition internally, meaning that we can define inside HoTT/UF, which types are propositions, sets or neither. Propositions are subsingleton types or types with at most one element. In other words, a proposition is a type P such that for all $x, y : P$ we have $x = y$. The intuition for this is that giving an element of P amounts to proving P . A proposition can be given a proof, but no further structure. There is nothing more to a proof than establishing the truth of the corresponding proposition, as any two proofs are regarded as equal.

A type S is called a set if for any $x, y : S$, the type of proofs of equality $x = y$ is a proposition. The intuition for this definition is rooted in the discrete nature of sets, where elements can be equal or not, but do not share any other relation. A subset of S is a function $S \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}$ from S into the type of propositions. This should be taken with a grain of salt, as we need to introduce universes to talk about things like the type of all propositions without running into paradoxes, see the discussion below. Only for a subset X of S , will we use the notation $x \in X$, denoting the type of proofs that $x : S$ is in X , i.e. the proposition that X (seen as a function) maps x to. For the Σ -type of $x : S$ with a proof that $x \in X$, we will use set-theory inspired notation writing $\{x : S \mid x \in X\}$ as in the HoTT-book [Uni13, 3.5.2]. As the proof of $x \in X$ can often be ignored, we will sometimes write $x : X$ for introducing an element of S that belongs to X . Strictly speaking, this is an abuse notation, identifying X as a function with the above Σ -type, but it reduces verbosity. The univalence axiom actually implies that certain types are not sets. For sets X and Y , the type $X = Y$ is not a proposition, but a set and it is in bijection with the set of bijections from X to Y . This means that the category of sets is a univalent category and we will discuss below, why this is actually a helpful feature for our purposes.

In order to describe existential quantification as a proposition, we need so-called *propositional truncation*, an operation that turns any type into a propo-

sition, by “truncating” or “squashing” any structure on objects. Following the HoTT-book we say that there *merely exists* an $a : A$ such that $P(a)$ if we have an object/proof of the truncated Σ -type, which we will write as $\exists_{a:A} P(a)$. Note that the truncation prevents us from extracting the “witness” a . This way choice principles when stated in terms of mere existence become unprovable in HoTT/UF. This is of course in line with constructive mathematics. Reasoning constructively about sets using propositions and truncations in HoTT/UF requires some getting used to, especially when concepts like set-quotients are involved.⁵ Ultimately, it is a rather rewarding approach that can provide some useful intuition for constructivity issues.

A point in which we depart from the HoTT-book in more than just notation is the treatment of universes. We do assume a (potentially infinite) hierarchy of univalent universes, closed under the usual type formers, indexed by their *level*: $\mathbf{Type}_0, \mathbf{Type}_1$, etc. However, we do not take these universes to be cumulative. Instead, we assume explicit embeddings $\mathit{lift} : \mathbf{Type}_\ell \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$ commuting with all the type formers. The reason for this is that we want our work to be in line with the results of [ZM23, ZH24] that are already formalized in `Cubical Agda`, which does not have cumulative universes. To remind the reader that we work with non-cumulative universes, we use `Agda`-like notation, but we omit levels whenever we are working within a single universe. For example, we write `Set` for the type or category of sets in a universe `Type` at an unspecified level. This type itself lives in the successor universe, but this can often be ignored. If size issues do matter, we will always be careful to annotate universe levels. Note that we are not assuming any form of impredicativity for our universes, such as Voevodsky’s resizing axioms [Voe11]. This means that the type \mathbf{Prop}_ℓ of propositions in \mathbf{Type}_ℓ lives in $\mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$. Similarly, for a set $S : \mathbf{Type}_\ell$ the type of subsets $S \rightarrow \mathbf{Prop}_\ell$ lives in $\mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$ as well.

Apart from the basics, we use concepts and results from category theory in HoTT/UF, as described in chapter 9 of the HoTT-book [Uni13]. An important difference in nomenclature is that by a *category* we denote what the HoTT-book would call a pre-category [Uni13, Def. 9.1.1], i.e. a structure consisting of a *type of objects* and *sets of arrows* between any two objects with identities and composition, satisfying the usual laws. For a category \mathcal{C} , we denote (with some abuse of notation) its type of objects by \mathcal{C} as well and the type of arrows as $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ for $x, y : \mathcal{C}$. For example `Set` is both the type of sets and the corresponding category (with functions as arrows) in a given universe. The basic theory of functors, natural transformations, (co-) limits and the Yoneda lemma can be developed in a very familiar, straightforward fashion in HoTT/UF for this notion of category. We write functors as if they were functions $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and omit projections for the action on objects or arrows. In particular, we have $F(x) : \mathcal{D}$ for $x : \mathcal{C}$ and $F(f) : \mathcal{D}(F(x), F(y))$ for $f : \mathcal{C}(x, y)$. Natural transfor-

⁵Here, we will not get into the details of how set-quotients are defined, but observe that for sets they work very much as expected.

mations between functors F and G are denoted by $F \Rightarrow G$ and the category of functors from \mathcal{C} to \mathcal{D} is denoted by $\text{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$.

Of special interest are so-called *univalent categories*. Those are categories for which the identity types on objects are canonically equivalent to types of isomorphisms (defined through inverse arrows). Arguably, they are the central notion of univalent category theory and are thus simply called categories in the HoTT-book [Uni13, Def. 9.1.6]. They are, however, a truly novel concept that has no counterpart outside of HoTT/UF. Certain things that are usually not provable in constructive category theory do hold for univalent categories in HoTT/UF. If $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ is a functor between univalent categories that is fully-faithful and essentially surjective, we can actually construct an adjoint inverse to F [Uni13, Lemma 9.4.5 & 9.4.7]. This will be used in the main Theorem 5.22.

Proving that a category is univalent usually requires the univalence axiom, or rather the so-called “structure identity principle” in combination with univalence [Uni13, Sec. 9.8]. This way, one can prove that not only the category of sets Set , but also categories of algebraic structures like commutative rings CommRing and distributive lattices DistLattice are univalent. There are several versions of the structure identity principle in the literature,⁶ so we do not want to go into details here. However, we will use it to prove that locally ringed lattices form a univalent category in Proposition 3.7. Readers not familiar with univalent category theory can regard this fact together with the aforementioned fact about functors between univalent categories as a black box, only required in the last step of proving the comparison theorem.

When working with univalent categories we can only give definitions and proofs that are invariant under isomorphisms. As mentioned in the introduction, this seems to fit the approach of the Grothendieck school. It is then not too surprising that virtually all of the categories appearing in this paper are univalent. As we saw for sets, however, objects of a univalent category do not necessarily form a set. This is not an issue of size but of identity types. The type of objects of a univalent category is in general a so-called “homotopy groupoid”. Even though the aim of this paper is to develop set-level constructive mathematics in HoTT/UF, non-sets will thus play an important role. The only place in the paper, where this is actually an issue is Example 3.9, where we define the structure sheaf of an affine scheme. Here, we do not want to get into any details and refer the interested reader to [ZM23]. Especially in view of the results of [ZM23] and this paper, we would like to argue that one should regard the occurrence of non-sets as a feature rather than a bug of univalent foundations of algebraic geometry.

⁶See [CD13, Uni13, Esc22, AL19, vBB21, ACMZ21].

2.2 The Zariski lattice

Both definitions of qcqs-schemes that we will give in this paper crucially rely on an important notion from constructive algebra, called the Zariski lattice of a ring. It can be seen as the constructive counterpart to the Zariski spectrum of a ring. A common starting point for algebraic geometry is the observation that for a any ring R , the set of prime ideals $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R$ can be equipped with a topology, the so-called Zariski topology. One can then define affine schemes and schemes using this “spectrum” $\text{Spec}(R)$. The Zariski open sets are generated by basic opens. For $f \in R$, the corresponding basic open is given as

$$D(f) = \{ \mathfrak{p} \mid f \notin \mathfrak{p} \}$$

From a constructive point of view this definition is not really workable. Point-set topology is already in itself inherently non-constructive and in the case of the Zariski spectrum of some general R , it is impossible to prove that there are any points (prime ideals) without invoking Zorn’s lemma or some other choice principle. One can, however, restrict to (quasi-) compact open subsets, which form a distributive lattice with finite set-theoretic union and intersection, the so-called Zariski lattice \mathcal{L}_R . Joyal observed that \mathcal{L}_R is described by a universal property, which is stated in terms of so-called *supports* [Joy76]. Note that in this paper we will always work with bounded distributive lattices, i.e. distributive lattices with a top and bottom element, and commutative rings with 1.

Definition 2.1. Let R be a commutative ring and L be a distributive lattice. A map $d : R \rightarrow L$ is called a *support* of L if

1. $d(0) = 0$ and $d(1) = 1$
2. $d(xy) = d(x) \wedge d(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$
3. $d(x + y) \leq d(x) \vee d(y)$ for all $x, y \in R$

Basic opens are always compact and the map $D : R \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_R$ is a support. In fact, it is a universal support in the following sense: For any support $d : R \rightarrow L$ there is a unique lattice homomorphism such that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ D \swarrow & & \searrow d \\ \mathcal{L}_R & \overset{\exists!}{\dashrightarrow} & L \end{array}$$

This means that we can define \mathcal{L}_R as the lattice generated by formal elements $D(f)$, modulo the equations given by the support conditions. There is also a more direct but still point-free way to construct the Zariski lattice. This is the approach taken by Español [En83] and Coquand and Lombardi [CL03].⁷ It

⁷The term Zariski lattice was coined in the paper by Coquand and Lombardi.

allows one to prove another important property of \mathcal{L}_R . The formalization of the Zariski lattice described in [ZM23] adopts this approach to the setting of `Cubical Agda`, i.e. to a dependent type theory with set-quotients but without impredicativity in the form of propositional resizing.

Classically, the Zariski open sets of $\text{Spec}(R)$ are in bijection with the radical ideals of R . Recall that an ideal $I \subseteq R$ is called a radical ideal if $I = \sqrt{I}$, where $\sqrt{I} := \{x : R \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{N} \ x^n \in I\}$. Predicatively, the type of ideals of $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ lives in $\text{Type}_{\ell+1}$. So, even though this gives us a point-free description of Zariski opens, it also introduces size issues or requires us to assume resizing. Fortunately, the situation is better behaved for (quasi-) compact opens. These are in bijection with radicals of finitely generated ideals, i.e. ideals of the form $\sqrt{\langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle}$, where $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$. Moreover, union and intersection of (quasi-) compact opens, i.e. join and meet of \mathcal{L}_R , correspond to addition and multiplication of finitely generated ideals. In other words, we can define \mathcal{L}_R as follows.

Definition 2.2. The *Zariski lattice* \mathcal{L}_R of a ring R has as elements lists of generators $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ modulo taking the radical of the ideal generated by the f_i . This means that lists of generators $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ and $g_1, \dots, g_m : R$ are in the same equivalence class of \mathcal{L}_R , if $\sqrt{\langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle}$.⁸ The equivalence class of the generators $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ is denoted by $D(f_1, \dots, f_n) : \mathcal{L}_R$. Join and meet are given by

$$\begin{aligned} D(f_1, \dots, f_n) \vee D(g_1, \dots, g_m) &::= D(f_1, \dots, f_n, g_1, \dots, g_m) \\ D(f_1, \dots, f_n) \wedge D(g_1, \dots, g_m) &::= D(f_1 g_1, \dots, f_i g_j, \dots, f_n g_m) \end{aligned}$$

The map $D : R \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_R$, sending $f : R$ to $D(f)$, the equivalence class of the radical of the principal ideal generated by f , $\sqrt{\langle f \rangle}$, is a support. It is straightforward to show that \mathcal{L}_R and D thus defined, satisfy the universal property of the Zariski lattice. However, we can also prove the following characterization of the induced order on \mathcal{L}_R :

$$\begin{aligned} D(f_1, \dots, f_n) \leq D(g_1, \dots, g_m) &\Leftrightarrow \sqrt{\langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle} \subseteq \sqrt{\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle} \\ &\Leftrightarrow f_i \in \sqrt{\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n \end{aligned}$$

This fact⁹ and the universal property let us prove all the relevant properties of the Zariski lattice without having to appeal to prime ideals.

If $\varphi : \text{Hom}(A, B)$ is a morphism of rings, $D \circ \varphi : A \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_B$ is a support and we

⁸Technically, the identity type $I = J$ of two (radical) ideals lives in $\text{Type}_{\ell+1}$, but in this particular instance we can replace it with a small proposition, as $\sqrt{\langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle}$ is equivalent to all the f_i being in $\sqrt{\langle g_1, \dots, g_m \rangle}$ and vice versa.

⁹This fact is called the ‘‘formal Hilbert Nullstellensatz’’ in [CLS09].

get an induced morphism between Zariski lattices

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & A & \\
 D \swarrow & & \searrow D \circ \varphi \\
 \mathcal{L}_A & \overset{\exists!}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{L}_B
 \end{array}$$

which we will denote by $\varphi^{\mathcal{L}}$. Classically, this lattice morphism takes pre-images of (quasi-) compact opens under the continuous map $\text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ induced by $\varphi : \text{Hom}(A, B)$. For $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$, we have $\varphi^{\mathcal{L}}(D(f_1, \dots, f_n)) = D(\varphi(f_1), \dots, \varphi(f_n))$.

An important fact in classical algebraic geometry is that $D(f)$ (as a subspace of $\text{Spec}(R)$) is homeomorphic to $\text{Spec}(R[1/f])$. The result carries over to the Zariski lattice, giving a bijection between (quasi-) compact opens of the two spaces. We want to finish this section on the Zariski lattice by giving a point-free proof of this fact that only uses the universal property. The result will be of importance later. For the remainder of this section we fix an element $f : R$. Recall that the ring $R[1/f]$ is a special case of a localization of R [AM69, Ch. 3].

Definition 2.3. The *localization of R away from f* is the ring $R[1/f]$ of fractions r/f^n where $r : R$ and the denominator is a power of f . Equality of two fractions is given by: $r/f^n = r'/f^m$ if and only if there merely exists a $k \geq 0$ such that $r f^{k+m} = r' f^{k+n}$. The universal property of the localization away from f can be stated as: For any ring A with a homomorphism $\varphi : \text{Hom}(R, A)$ such that $\varphi(f) \in A^\times$ (i.e. $\varphi(f)$ is a unit/invertible), there is a unique $\psi : \text{Hom}(R[1/f], A)$ making the following diagram commute

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & R & \\
 _ / 1 \swarrow & & \searrow \varphi \\
 R[1/f] & \overset{\exists! \psi}{\dashrightarrow} & A
 \end{array}$$

where $_ / 1 : \text{Hom}(R, R[1/f])$ is the canonical morphism mapping $r : R$ to the fraction $r/1$. In other words, $R[1/f]$ is the initial R -algebra where f becomes invertible.

Lemma 2.4. For $f : R$ we have an isomorphism of lattices $\psi_f : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]} \cong \downarrow D(f)$ between the Zariski lattice of the localization $R[1/f]$ and the elements of \mathcal{L}_R below $D(f)$, i.e. the down-set $\downarrow D(f) \equiv \{u : \mathcal{L}_R \mid u \leq D(f)\}$.

Proof. Consider the map $d : R[1/f] \rightarrow \downarrow D(f)$ given by $d(r/f^n) \equiv D(r) \wedge D(f)$. This defines a support and thus induces $\psi_f : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]} \rightarrow \downarrow D(f)$. For the inverse direction take the support $D(_ / 1) : R \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]}$ and the induced map $(_ / 1)^{\mathcal{L}} : \mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]}$. Restricting this to $\downarrow D(f)$, gives us the inverse ψ_f^{-1} . Note that this is indeed a lattice morphism, since the top element of $\downarrow D(f)$ is $D(f)$ and $\psi_f^{-1}(D(f)) = D(f/1) = D(1/1)$ as $f/1$ is a unit in $R[1/f]$.

In order to prove that the two maps are inverse to each other, we claim that the map $_ \wedge D(f) : \mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \downarrow D(f)$ factors through ψ_f . In particular, we claim that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
R & \xrightarrow{-/1} & R[1/f] & & \\
D \downarrow & & D \downarrow & \searrow d & \\
\mathcal{L}_R & \xrightarrow{(-/1)^{\mathcal{L}}} & \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]} & \xrightarrow{\psi_f} & \downarrow D(f) \\
& \searrow _ \wedge D(f) & & &
\end{array}$$

This follows from the universal property of \mathcal{L}_R , which gives a unique $\phi : \mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \downarrow D(f)$, such that $\phi \circ D = d(-/1)$. But both $_ \wedge D(f)$ and $\psi_f \circ (-/1)^{\mathcal{L}}$ satisfy the same commutativity condition as ϕ , which implies that they have to be the same lattice morphism. For $u \leq D(f)$ we therefore get $(\psi_f \circ \psi_f^{-1})(u) = u \wedge D(f) = u$.

For the converse direction, observe that $\psi_f^{-1} \circ d = \psi_f^{-1} \circ \psi_f \circ D$ is a support. Consequently, there is a unique morphism such that the following commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& R[1/f] & \\
D \swarrow & & \searrow \psi_f^{-1} \circ d = \psi_f^{-1} \circ \psi_f \circ D \\
\mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]} & \xrightarrow{\exists!} & \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f]}
\end{array}$$

Obviously, $\psi_f^{-1} \circ \psi_f$ satisfies this, but also the identity morphism as

$$(\psi_f \circ \psi_f^{-1})(D(r/f^n)) = (-/1)^{\mathcal{L}}(D(rf)) = D(rf/1) = D(r/f^n)$$

since $f/1$ is a unit and D is a support. This finishes the proof that ψ_f and ψ_f^{-1} are inverse. \square

3 Spectral schemes as locally ringed lattices

In the previous section we claimed that the Zariski lattice should be used as the point-free, constructive spectrum of a ring. Much like in the classical case, a ring is not determined by its Zariski lattice. Indeed, for any ring R we have $\mathcal{L}_R \cong \mathcal{L}_{R/\mathfrak{N}}$, where $\mathfrak{N} = \sqrt{\langle 0 \rangle}$ is the nilradical of R . In order to recover the original ring, one needs to equip the Zariski spectrum or lattice with its *structure sheaf*. This construction was used as the point of departure by Coquand, Lombardi and Schuster to develop ‘‘Spectral Schemes as Ringed Lattices’’ [CLS09]. If one wants to recover ring morphisms from their action on Zariski lattice and structure sheaf, one needs to introduce some additional structure making the constructive spectrum a locally ringed lattice. In this section we want to redevelop key results of [CLS09] for ‘‘spectral schemes’’ as *locally* ringed lattices. This gives a rather neat and point-free account of these spectral schemes. From a classical

perspective these are really just qcqs-schemes, as we will see at the end of this section. In particular, this lets us relate the lattice theoretic approach to schemes with the functor of points approach, as we will show in this paper.

3.1 From ringed lattices to locally ringed lattices

Let us begin by repeating the definition of a ringed lattice as given by Coquand, Lombardi and Schuster [CLS09].

Definition 3.1. Let L be a distributive lattice and $\mathcal{F} : L^{op} \rightarrow \text{CommRing}$ a ring-valued presheaf on L (seen as a poset category). We say that \mathcal{F} is a sheaf if for all $x, u_1, \dots, u_n : L$ with $x = \bigvee_{i=1}^n u_i$ we get a canonical equalizer diagram

$$\mathcal{F}(x) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{F}(u_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{F}(u_i \wedge u_j)$$

A *ringed lattice* is a distributive lattice with a sheaf of rings. Given ringed lattices (L, \mathcal{F}) and (M, \mathcal{G}) , a morphism of ringed lattices $\pi : (L, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{G})$ is a pair $\pi := (\pi^*, \pi^\sharp)$ consisting of a lattice homomorphism $\pi^* : L \rightarrow M$ and a natural transformation $\pi^\sharp : \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{G}$, where $\pi_* \mathcal{G} : L^{op} \rightarrow \text{CommRing}$ is the sheaf defined by $\pi_* \mathcal{G}(u) := \mathcal{G}(\pi^*(u))$. The category of ringed lattices and their morphisms is denoted RDL.

The motivation for this definition is based on the classical fact that distributive lattices correspond to the compact open subsets of so-called coherent or spectral spaces. An in-depth discussion is included in Section 3.4. Building on the definition of ringed lattice, and with the correspondence to ringed spectral spaces in mind, the question arises whether one can define locally ringed lattices corresponding to locally ringed spectral spaces without appealing to point-set topology or the notion of stalk of a sheaf.

In the context of formal topology, it was observed by Schuster [Sch08] that sheaves of local rings can be characterized in a point-free way by using supports and a second notion, which we will call invertibility suprema or invertibility opens. The notion of invertibility opens was used by Hakim [Hak72, Sec. III.2] to define locally ringed *topoi*. We want to apply these notions to ringed lattices, following a suggestion by Thierry Coquand. Coquand observed that one can always define an “invertibility support” on a spectral scheme and use it to characterize local morphisms. We will discuss why this works classically in Section 3.4.

Definition 3.2. Let P be a poset and $\mathcal{F} : P^{op} \rightarrow \text{CommRing}$ a ring-valued presheaf. For an object $u : P$ and a section $s : \mathcal{F}(u)$, an element $u_s \leq u$ is called an *invertibility supremum* of s , if for all $w \leq u$ we have that

$$w \leq u_s \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad s|_w \in \mathcal{F}(w)^\times$$

In other words, u_s is the largest element smaller than u where the restriction of s becomes invertible.

A dependent function $\mathcal{D} : (u : P) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(u) \rightarrow \downarrow u$, is called an *invertibility map* if $\mathcal{D}_u(s)$ is an invertibility supremum of s for all $u : P$ and $s : \mathcal{F}(u)$.

Remark 3.3. If u_s is an invertibility supremum of $s : \mathcal{F}(u)$, for $u : P$, then clearly $s|_{u_s} \in \mathcal{F}(u_s)^\times$. In particular, by anti-symmetry, invertibility suprema are uniquely determined if they exist and we will henceforth speak of *the* invertibility supremum of s . In univalent terms, the type of invertibility suprema of u and s is a proposition. It follows that for a poset P and presheaf \mathcal{F} , the type of invertibility maps is a proposition as well.

Definition 3.4. A *locally ringed lattice* is a distributive lattice L with a sheaf of rings \mathcal{F} and an invertibility map $\mathcal{D} : (u : L) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}(u) \rightarrow \downarrow u$, such that \mathcal{D}_u is a support for all $u : L$. We call \mathcal{D} the *invertibility support* on (L, \mathcal{F}) .

A morphism of locally ringed lattices is a morphism of ringed lattices $\pi := (\pi^*, \pi^\sharp) : (L, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{G})$ such that for all $u : L$ and $s : \mathcal{F}(u)$:

$$\pi^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s)) = \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(u)}(\pi^\sharp(s))$$

The category of locally ringed distributive lattices will be denoted by LRDL.

Remark 3.5. Although invertibility supports are given as additional structure on ringed lattices, we will write locally ringed lattices as pairs (L, \mathcal{F}) and always denote the implicit invertibility support by \mathcal{D} . It will always be clear from context which locally ringed lattice an invertibility support corresponds to. This notation is motivated by the fact that invertibility supports are uniquely determined (if they exist), as explained in Remark 3.3.

Remark 3.6. If $\pi : (L, \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow (M, \mathcal{G})$ is a morphism of ringed lattices, then for $u : L$ and $s : \mathcal{F}(u)$ one always has $\pi^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s)) \leq \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(u)}(\pi^\sharp(s))$, as by the naturality of π^\sharp :

$$\pi^\sharp(s)|_{\pi^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s))} = \pi^\sharp(s|_{\mathcal{D}_u(s)}) \in \mathcal{G}(\pi^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s)))^\times$$

π is thus a morphism of locally ringed lattices if and only if the converse inequality holds for all u and s .

Nothing in the definition of locally ringed lattices depends on univalent features and the notion can and should be studied in other settings than HoTT/UF, such as Bishop-style constructive mathematics. What is, however, important for our purposes, is that it is a structurally well-behaved notion in the sense that for locally ringed lattices “isomorphisms are equalities”. This will actually be a key fact in the proof of our main comparison theorem.

Proposition 3.7. LRDL is a univalent category.

Proof. Instead of proving that locally ringed lattices and their isomorphisms are a “standard notion of structure” [Uni13, Def. 9.8.1] directly, it is easier to use a “displayed” approach [AL19, vBB21].¹⁰ It is not hard to show that bounded distributive lattices with lattice morphisms form a univalent category and lattice sheaves with natural transformations form a univalent displayed category on lattices. Finally, invertibility supports, with their canonical notion of (displayed) morphism being exactly that of a morphism of locally ringed lattices, form a univalent displayed category on ringed lattices. \square

Corollary 3.8. *The forgetful functor \mathcal{U} from locally ringed lattices to ringed lattices reflects isomorphisms.*

Proof. Since the type of invertibility supports over a ringed lattice is a proposition, the structure identity principle implies that both of the canonical maps $X = Y \rightarrow X \cong_{\text{LRDL}} Y$ and $X = Y \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(X) \cong_{\text{RDL}} \mathcal{U}(Y)$ are equivalences for $X, Y : \text{LRDL}$. \square

Example 3.9. The main example of a locally ringed lattice will of course be the “constructive spectrum” of a ring. For $R : \text{CommRing}$ we can equip the Zariski lattice \mathcal{L}_R with its structure sheaf \mathcal{O}_R . The structure sheaf is defined on basic opens and then lifted to the entire Zariski lattice. The basic opens as a subset $\mathcal{B}_R \equiv \{u : \mathcal{L}_R \mid \exists f : R. u = D(f)\} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_R$ form a basis of the Zariski lattice in the sense that for every $u : \mathcal{L}_R$ there merely exist $b_1, \dots, b_n : \mathcal{B}_R$ such that $u = \bigvee_{i=1}^n b_i$.¹¹ By the *comparison lemma for distributive lattices* [CLS09, Lemma 1]¹² there is an equivalence of categories between sheaves on \mathcal{L}_R and sheaves on the basis \mathcal{B}_R . Here, sheaves on a basis of a distributive lattice are defined completely analogously to Definition 3.1 and morphisms of sheaves are just natural transformations. Given a sheaf \mathcal{F} on \mathcal{B}_R , the equivalence of the comparison lemma maps this to a sheaf on \mathcal{L}_R by taking the *right Kan extension* $\text{Ran}(\mathcal{F})$ along the basis inclusion.

As was shown in the `Cubical Agda` formalization of the structure sheaf described in [ZM23], we can use univalence to define the structure sheaf on basic opens by mapping $D(f) \mapsto R[1/f]$.¹³ In this paper we do not want to get into the details of how the structure sheaf is defined and just work with a sheaf $\mathcal{O}_R : (\mathcal{L}_R)^{op} \rightarrow \text{CommRing}$, such that $\mathcal{O}_R(D(f)) \cong R[1/f]$ canonically. This

¹⁰The `agda/cubical`-library uses the approach of [vBB21] and supports some automation for proving that structures are univalent. An earlier version described in [ACMZ21] was based on [Esc22] that also has a modular approach to building univalent structures, albeit not a displayed one. Formalizing locally ringed lattices and proving them univalent could figure as an interesting test case for the proof automation tools, as it involves two layers of displayedness.

¹¹As \mathcal{L}_R is defined as a quotient, we know that merely $u = D(f_1, \dots, f_n) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n D(f_i)$.

¹²This is a special case of the general comparison lemma for sites [MLM12, Cor. 3, p. 590]. The lattice case is formalized in `Cubical Agda` and can be found in: <https://github.com/agda/cubical/blob/master/Cubical/Categories/DistLatticeSheaf/ComparisonLemma.agda>.

¹³In [CLS09, Sec. 2.3], the structure sheaf on basic opens is defined using localization at the saturation $S_f = \{g \mid D(f) \leq D(g)\}$.

means that these isomorphisms satisfy all of the expected functoriality and naturality conditions. Note however, that definitions and proofs appealing to the canonical isomorphism need to be rephrased to accommodate for the formal definition of the structure sheaf, before becoming formalizable themselves.

Observe that in any locally ringed lattice one has $w \wedge \mathcal{D}_u(s) = \mathcal{D}_w(s \upharpoonright_w)$, for $w \leq u$ and thus for joins we must have

$$\mathcal{D}_{u_1 \vee \dots \vee u_n}(s) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s \upharpoonright_{u_i})$$

In order to define an invertibility support on $(\mathcal{L}_R, \mathcal{O}_R)$, it is thus sufficient to define \mathcal{D} on the basic opens. Modulo the canonical isomorphism we can set:

$$\mathcal{D}_{D(f)}(\tau/f^n) := D(fr) \quad (= D(f) \wedge D(r))$$

Indeed, this gives us the invertibility supremum, since $R[1/fr] \cong R[1/f][1/r]$ is the initial $R[1/f]$ -algebra where $r/1$ becomes invertible.¹⁴ For arbitrary elements of the Zariski lattice we can then set:

$$\mathcal{D}_{D(f_1, \dots, f_n)}(s) := \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{D(f_i)}(s \upharpoonright_{D(f_i)})$$

By the above remark, this gives us an invertibility map.¹⁵ To check the support conditions we can again restrict our attention to basic opens where everything follows the fact that D is a support. Note that $\mathcal{D}_{D(1)} = D$ modulo the canonical $\mathcal{O}_R(D(1)) \cong R$.

3.2 Universal property

In classical algebraic geometry, the following proposition is sometimes called the “universal property of schemes”:

The functor \mathbf{Spec} is left-adjoint to the global sections functor Γ and the unit of this adjunction is an isomorphism.

This is of course already true when regarding \mathbf{Spec} as a functor from rings to locally ringed spaces [DG71, Prop 1.6.3], Schuster [Sch08] gives a constructive proof of a point-free version of this statement using formal topology.¹⁶ We want to show the corresponding statement for locally ringed lattices.

Let us start by addressing the issue of variance that arises when the spectrum functor \mathbf{Spec} is introduced as a contra-variant functor from rings to locally ringed spaces. This makes the direction of the adjunction somewhat arbitrary. In the functorial setting of Proposition 4.6 it is more natural to think of the spectrum

¹⁴Note that $\mathcal{D}_{D(f)}$ is the support d in the proof of Lemma 2.4.

¹⁵The well-definedness of this construction follows from the fact that the type of invertibility maps is a proposition.

¹⁶Curiously, previous proofs in the literature, such as the one given by Johnstone in “Stone Spaces” [Joh82, V.3.5], appeal to classical reasoning by using the points of \mathbf{Spec} , even if the Zariski spectrum is defined in a point-free way.

functor as the right adjoint. In order to match this we will thus work in opposite categories $\mathbf{CommRing}^{op}$ and \mathbf{LRDL}^{op} .

This actually makes a lot of sense for morphisms locally ringed lattices. As is explained in Section 3.4, readers familiar with classical algebraic geometry should think of a locally ringed lattice (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X) as a so-called spectral space X with a sheaf of rings that is local on the stalks. The lattice L_X is the lattice of compact open subsets of X . A spectral morphism of suitable locally ringed spectral spaces $f : X \rightarrow Y$ induces a lattice morphism $f^* : L_Y \rightarrow L_X$, by taking the pre-image of compact opens of Y (spectral morphism means that pre-images of compact opens are compact open).

For an object in $X : \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}$ we denote its lattice by L_X and its sheaf by \mathcal{O}_X . A morphism $\pi : \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}(X, Y)$ is given by the lattice morphism $\pi^* : L_Y \rightarrow L_X$, similar to how a morphism of locales is given by a frame homomorphism in the opposite direction, and the natural transformation $\pi^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_Y \Rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_X$.

Definition 3.10. The *global sections functor* $\Gamma : \mathbf{LRDL}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{CommRing}^{op}$ is defined on objects by $\Gamma(L_X, \mathcal{O}_X) := \mathcal{O}_X(1)$ and on morphisms $\pi : \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}(X, Y)$ by $\Gamma(\pi) := \pi_1^\sharp$ modulo the identification $\mathcal{O}_X(\pi^*(1)) = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$.

Definition 3.11. The functor $\mathbf{Spec} : \mathbf{CommRing}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}$ is defined on objects by $\mathbf{Spec}(R) := (\mathcal{L}_R, \mathcal{O}_R)$ as described in Example 3.9. For a ring morphism $\varphi : \mathbf{Hom}(R, A)$, we set $\mathbf{Spec}(\varphi)^* := \varphi^\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_A$. To define the natural transformation $\mathbf{Spec}(\varphi)^\sharp$, we only have to define it on basic opens. For $f : R$, we set modulo the canonical isomorphisms $\mathcal{O}_R(D(f)) \cong R[1/f]$ and $\mathcal{O}_A(\varphi^\mathcal{L}(D(f))) \cong \mathcal{O}_A(D(\varphi(f))) \cong A[1/\varphi(f)]$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ \swarrow_{-/1} & & \searrow_{\varphi(-)/1} \\ R[1/f] & \overset{\exists! \mathbf{Spec}(\varphi)^\sharp}{\dashrightarrow} & A[1/\varphi(f)] \end{array}$$

One easily checks that this defines a morphism of locally ringed lattices.

Theorem 3.12. *Spec is right adjoint to Γ and the counit of this adjunction is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Given a commutative ring R and a locally ringed lattice $X := (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, there is a canonical function

$$\mathbf{CommRing}^{op}(\mathcal{O}_X(1), R) \rightarrow \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}(X, \mathbf{Spec}(R))$$

Let $\varphi : \mathbf{Hom}(R, \mathcal{O}_L(1))$ be a ring homomorphism. Note that $\mathcal{D}_1 \circ \varphi : R \rightarrow L_X$ is a support. This induces a lattice homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ \swarrow_D & & \searrow_{\mathcal{D}_1 \circ \varphi} \\ \mathcal{L}_R & \overset{\exists! \pi^*}{\dashrightarrow} & L \end{array}$$

Furthermore, for every $f : R$ we get a map

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & R & \\
 \swarrow & & \searrow \\
 R[1/f] & \xrightarrow{\exists! \pi^\sharp} & \mathcal{O}_L(\underbrace{\mathcal{D}_1(\varphi(f))}_{= \pi^*(D(f))})
 \end{array}$$

$\varphi(_) \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{D}_1(\varphi(f))}$

This defines a natural transformation between sheaves on basic opens and thus on \mathcal{L}_R by the comparison lemma for distributive lattices. It remains to check that this defines a morphism of locally ringed lattices. Note that on global sections we have by the definition of π^* and π^\sharp that

$$\pi^*(D(f)) = \mathcal{D}_1(\varphi(f)) = \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(D(1))}(\pi^\sharp(f))$$

modulo identifying $\mathcal{O}_R(D(1))$ with R . Thus on arbitrary basic opens, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_{D(f)}(r/f^n)) &= \mathcal{D}_1(\pi^\sharp(rf)) \\
 &= \mathcal{D}_1(\pi^\sharp(r)) \wedge \mathcal{D}_1(\pi^\sharp(f)) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{D}_1(\pi^\sharp(f))}(\pi^\sharp(r/f^n))
 \end{aligned}$$

and finally on arbitrary elements

$$\begin{aligned}
 \pi(\mathcal{D}_{D(f_1) \vee \dots \vee D(f_n)}(s)) &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{\pi(D(f_i))}(\pi^\sharp(s) \upharpoonright_{\pi(D(f_i))}) \\
 &= \mathcal{D}_{\pi(D(f_1) \vee \dots \vee D(f_n))}(\pi^\sharp(s))
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that the action of \mathbf{Spec} on morphisms is essentially the same construction. We omit the computations for showing that this is natural in both R and X .

The inverse of this map is given by Γ . Indeed, it follows directly that for a ring morphism $\varphi : \mathbf{Hom}(R, \mathcal{O}_L(1))$ one has $\varphi = \pi^\sharp$ on global sections. For the other direction fix a morphism $\pi : \mathbf{LRDL}^{op}(X, \mathbf{Spec}(R))$ and observe that the following diagram commutes for π^\sharp at global sections.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & R & \\
 \swarrow D & & \searrow \mathcal{D}_1 \circ \pi^\sharp \\
 \mathcal{L}_R & \xrightarrow{\pi^*} & L_X
 \end{array}$$

as well as for $f : R$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & R & \\
 \swarrow & & \searrow \\
 R[1/f] & \xrightarrow{\pi^\sharp} & \mathcal{O}_L(\pi(D(f)))
 \end{array}$$

$\pi^\sharp(_) \upharpoonright_{\mathcal{D}_1(\pi^\sharp(f))}$

This shows that π is just the morphism obtained from applying the adjunction map to π^\sharp at global sections. From this we also get that the counit is an isomorphism. Indeed, for a ring R it is the canonical isomorphism $R \cong \mathcal{O}_R(D(1))$. \square

Corollary 3.13. *Spec is fully faithful.*

3.3 Spectral schemes

Let X be a locally ringed lattice and $R := \mathcal{O}_X(1)$ be the ring of global sections. We saw that the counit of the adjunction of Theorem 3.12 is an isomorphism. But what about its unit? Following the proof of Theorem 3.12 for the identity on R , we see that the lattice homomorphism is induced by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ D \swarrow & & \searrow \mathcal{D}_1 \\ \mathcal{L}_R & \overset{\exists! \eta_X^*}{\dashrightarrow} & L_X \end{array}$$

and the natural transformation $\eta_X^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_R \rightarrow (\eta_X)_* \mathcal{O}_X$ is given on a basic open $D(f)$, $f : R$, by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & R & \\ \swarrow & & \searrow _ \uparrow_{\mathcal{D}_1(f)} \\ R[1/f] & \overset{\exists! \eta_X^*}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{O}_X \left(\underbrace{\mathcal{D}_1(f)}_{= \eta_X^*(D(f))} \right) \end{array}$$

Definition 3.14. X is an *affine scheme*, if η_X is an isomorphism of locally ringed lattices.

Lemma 3.15. $\text{Spec}(R)$ is affine.

Lemma 3.16. X is affine if and only if there exists a ring A such that $X \cong \text{Spec}(A)$ as locally ringed lattices.

Proof. Spec is fully faithful. □

Remark 3.17. The advantage of Definition 3.14, compared to characterizing affine schemes by the equivalent statement of Lemma 3.16, is that the latter is a “big” proposition living in the next higher universe as it quantifies over the type of all rings.

For a locally ringed lattice X and $u : L_X$, we get a locally ringed lattice $X|_u := (\downarrow u, \mathcal{O}_X|_{\downarrow u})$ of elements below u with the sheaf \mathcal{O}_X restricted to those elements. The lattice morphism $_ \wedge u : L_X \rightarrow \downarrow u$ induces a map $\text{LRDL}^{op}(X|_u, X)$, which we think of as the “inclusion” of the compact open u into X .

Definition 3.18. X is a *qcqs-scheme*, if there merely exist $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$, which cover X in the sense that $1 = u_1 \vee \dots \vee u_n$ and such that $X|_{u_i}$ is affine for all i in $1, \dots, n$.

Example 3.19. Let us discuss the standard example of a qcqs-scheme that is not affine: The plane without the origin $\mathbb{A}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ over some fixed field k . Classically, the points of $\mathbb{A}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ correspond to $D(x, y) \subseteq \text{Spec}(k[x, y])$. The goal is thus to prove that $\text{Spec}(k[x, y])|_{D(x, y)}$ is not affine, where $D(x, y) : \mathcal{L}_{k[x, y]}$. By the sheaf property of the structure sheaf, we get the following pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{O}_{k[x,y]}(D(x,y)) & \longrightarrow & k[x,y,y^{-1}] \\
\downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\
k[x,y,x^{-1}] & \longrightarrow & k[x,y,x^{-1},y^{-1}]
\end{array}$$

Since this is a pullback of integral domains we can identify $\mathcal{O}_{k[x,y]}(D(x,y))$ with the subring $k[x,y,x^{-1}] \cap k[x,y,y^{-1}] \subseteq k[x,y,x^{-1},y^{-1}]$. One can show that this already gives us a unique isomorphism of k -algebras $k[x,y] \cong \mathcal{O}_{k[x,y]}(D(x,y))$. If $\text{Spec}(k[x,y]) \upharpoonright_{D(x,y)}$ was affine we would get an isomorphism of lattices

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& k[x,y] & \\
D \swarrow & & \searrow (D(x) \vee D(y)) \wedge D(_) \\
\mathcal{L}_{k[x,y]} & \overset{\cong}{\dashrightarrow} & \downarrow D(x,y)
\end{array}$$

This morphism has to be $D(x,y) \wedge _$, which is not an isomorphism, giving the desired contradiction.

It was already shown in [CLS09] that qcqs-schemes are obtained by “gluing” together affine schemes. For a cover u_1, \dots, u_n of X we can glue along the corresponding “inclusions” $X \upharpoonright_{u_i} \rightarrow X$ to recover X . This was shown for ringed lattices in [CLS09, Lemma 2], but the proof extends directly to locally ringed lattices. We thus give the following proposition without proof.

Proposition 3.20. *If X is a qcqs-scheme and $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$ an (affine) cover of X , then*

$$X \cong \text{colim} \{ X \upharpoonright_{u_i} \leftarrow X \upharpoonright_{u_i \wedge u_j} \rightarrow X \upharpoonright_{u_j} \}$$

in the opposite category of locally ringed lattices LRDL^{op} . In particular, if we have $X \upharpoonright_{u_i} \cong \text{Spec}(A_i)$, and we are given affine covers $(v_{ijk} : \downarrow(u_i \wedge u_j))_k$ of the subschemes $X \upharpoonright_{u_i \wedge u_j}$ with $X \upharpoonright_{v_{ijk}} \cong \text{Spec}(A_{ijk})$, we have

$$X \cong \text{colim} \{ \text{Spec}(A_i) \leftarrow \text{Spec}(A_{ijk}) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A_j) \}$$

Corollary 3.21. *Let X be a qcqs-scheme, then $\mathcal{O}_X(\mathcal{D}_u(s)) \cong \mathcal{O}_X(u)[1/s]$, for any $u : L_X$ and $s : \mathcal{O}_X(u)$.¹⁷*

We conclude this section on our first definition of qcqs-schemes by showing that the notion of morphism of spectral schemes given in [CLS09, Def. 16] coincides with morphisms of locally ringed lattices.

Definition 3.22. Let $X := (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ and $Y := (L_Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ be two qcqs-schemes, a morphism of ringed lattices $\pi : \text{RDL}^{op}(X, Y)$ is called *locally affine* if there are affine covers u_1, \dots, u_n of L_X and w_1, \dots, w_m of L_Y respectively, which are

¹⁷This is also known as the “Qcqs-Lemma” in “The Rising Sea” [Vak24].

compatible in the following way: For every u_i exists a w_j with $u_i \leq \pi^*(w_j)$ such that the morphism of ringed lattices $\pi|_{u_i} : \text{RDL}^{op}(X|_{u_i}, Y|_{w_j})$, which is induced by the lattice morphism $\pi^*(_) \wedge u_i : \downarrow w_j \rightarrow \downarrow u_i$, is just Spec applied to the ring morphism $\pi^\sharp|_{u_i} : \mathcal{O}_Y(w_j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(u_i)$, i.e. the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X|_{u_i} & \xrightarrow{\pi|_{u_i}} & Y|_{w_j} \\ \eta_X|_{u_i} \downarrow \wr & & \wr \downarrow \eta_Y|_{w_j} \\ \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X(u_i)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Spec}(\pi^\sharp|_{u_i})} & \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_Y(w_j)) \end{array}$$

Remark 3.23. Since Spec is fully-faithful, a morphism $\pi : \text{RDL}^{op}(X, Y)$ is locally affine if and only if there are compatible affine covers u_1, \dots, u_n of L_X and w_1, \dots, w_m of L_Y such that for $u_i \leq \pi^*(w_j)$ the induced morphism $\pi|_{u_i} : \text{RDL}^{op}(X|_{u_i}, Y|_{w_j})$ is a morphism of locally ringed lattices.

Lemma 3.24. *Let X and Y be two qcqs-schemes, then any morphism of ringed lattices $\pi : \text{RDL}^{op}(X, Y)$ is locally affine if and only if it is a morphism of locally ringed lattices.*

Proof. First, assume that (π^*, π^\sharp) is a morphism of locally ringed lattices. take affine covers u_1, \dots, u_n of L_X and w_1, \dots, w_m of L_Y . We can refine the u_i 's to a compatible cover in the following way. For each i and j take a cover $\pi^*(w_j) \wedge u_i = \bigvee_k \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk})$. Such a cover exists because u_i is affine and all $\mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk})$ are affine as well, i.e. $X|_{\mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk})} = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X(u_i)[1/s_{ijk}])$. Then $1_{L_X} = \bigvee_{i,j,k} \mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk})$, with $\mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk}) \leq \pi^*(w_j)$ and the induced/restricted morphism $X|_{\mathcal{D}_{u_i}(s_{ijk})} \rightarrow Y|_{w_j}$ is one of locally ringed lattices, hence affine.

Now, assume that we have compatible covers u_1, \dots, u_n of L_X and w_1, \dots, w_m of L_Y , with $u_i \leq \pi^*(w_j)$ such that $\pi|_{u_i} : \text{RDL}^{op}(X|_{u_i}, Y|_{w_j})$ is actually a morphism of locally ringed lattices. This means that for $v \leq w_j$ and $s : \mathcal{O}_Y(v)$ we have

$$u_i \wedge \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_v(s)) = \mathcal{D}_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(v)}(\pi^\sharp(s)|_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(v)}) = u_i \wedge \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(v)}(\pi^\sharp(s))$$

For $w : L_Y$ and $s : \mathcal{O}_Y(w)$ we have that $u_i \wedge \pi^*(w) = u_i \wedge \pi^*(w_j \wedge w)$, since $u_i \leq \pi^*(w_j)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(w)}(\pi^\sharp(s)|_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(w)}) &= u_i \wedge \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(w_j \wedge w)}(\pi^\sharp(s)|_{\pi^*(w_j \wedge w)}) \\ &= u_i \wedge \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_{w_j \wedge w}(s|_{w_j \wedge w})) \\ &\leq \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_{w_j \wedge w}(s|_{w_j \wedge w})) \end{aligned}$$

and hence, since for each i there exists a compatible j ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(w)}(\pi^\sharp(s)) &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(w)}(\pi^\sharp(s)|_{u_i \wedge \pi^*(w)}) \\ &\leq \bigvee_{j=1}^m \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_{w_j \wedge w}(s|_{w_j \wedge w})) \\ &= \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_w(s)) \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

3.4 Classical characterization

Before moving on, we want to sketch why the definition of qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices given above is actually equivalent to the standard definition using locally ringed spaces. This section is addressed to readers familiar with classical algebraic geometry. For this section only, we leave the realm of constructive type theory and adopt set-theoretic notation.

First, it is worth checking that invertibility supports are related to sheaves of local rings. Observe that any ringed space (X, \mathcal{O}_X) has arbitrary invertibility suprema. For any open $U \subseteq X$ and $s \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, we can define

$$\mathcal{D}_U(s) = \{x \in U \mid s_x \in \mathcal{O}_{X,x}^\times\}$$

\mathcal{D} is easily seen to be an invertibility map (on opens of X and \mathcal{O}_X). $\mathcal{D}_U(s)$ is sometimes called the *invertibility open* of s .¹⁸ Moreover, it contains all information about locality on the stalks, as the following propositions show.

Proposition 3.25. *(X, \mathcal{O}_X) is a locally ringed space if and only if \mathcal{D}_U is a support for all opens $U \subseteq X$.*

Proof. Note that we always have

$$\mathcal{D}_U(1) = U \quad \& \quad \forall s, t : \mathcal{D}_U(st) = \mathcal{D}_U(s) \cap \mathcal{D}_U(t)$$

So what we actually want to prove is that (X, \mathcal{O}_X) is a locally ringed space if and only if for all open sets U we have:

$$\mathcal{D}_U(0) = \emptyset \quad \& \quad \forall s, t : \mathcal{D}_U(s + t) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_U(s) \cup \mathcal{D}_U(t)$$

Recall that a ring A is local if and only if it is non-trivial and the non-units $A \setminus A^\times$ form an ideal, which is the case if and only if $A \setminus A^\times$ is closed under addition. Taking the contrapositive of the last statement, we arrive at: *A is local iff it is non-trivial and $s + t \in A^\times$ implies $s \in A^\times$ or $t \in A^\times$.*¹⁹ Using this characterization for the stalks $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$ the claim immediately follows. \square

Proposition 3.26. *$(f, f^\#) : (X, \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow (Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$ is a morphism of locally ringed spaces if and only if for every open $U \subseteq Y$ and section $s \in \mathcal{O}_Y(U)$:²⁰*

$$f^{-1}(\mathcal{D}_U(s)) = \mathcal{D}_{f^{-1}(U)}(f^\#(s))$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that a homomorphism of local rings $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$ is local if and only if $\varphi(a) \in B^\times$ implies $a \in A^\times$. \square

¹⁸See [Hak72, Def. 2.1].

¹⁹In fact, this is usually taken to be the constructive definition of a local ring.

²⁰In [Hak72, Def. 2.9], a morphism of ringed topoi satisfying the analogous condition is called *admissible*.

The next step is to establish a connection between (ringed) lattices and (ringed) spaces. The main result that makes this possible is *Stone’s representation theorem for distributive lattices* [Sto38]. It gives a (contravariant) equivalence of categories between distributive lattices and a special class of topological spaces, called *coherent* or *spectral* spaces. A topological space X is coherent if it is *quasi-compact, sober* (its non-empty irreducible closed subsets are the closure of a single point), and its quasi-compact opens are closed under finite intersections and form a basis of the topology of X . A coherent map between coherent spaces X and Y is a continuous map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ such that for any quasi-compact open $K \subseteq Y$, its pre-image $f^{-1}(K)$ is quasi-compact.

The category \mathbf{CohSp} consists of coherent spaces with coherent maps. The equivalence $\mathbf{CohSp} \simeq \mathbf{DL}^{op}$ sends a coherent space X to its lattice of quasi-compact opens $\mathbf{K}^o(X)$ and a coherent map $f : X \rightarrow Y$ to the pre-image lattice homomorphism $f^{-1} : \mathbf{K}^o(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{K}^o(X)$. The inverse can also be defined explicitly, assigning to a distributive lattice L the space of points of the locale of L -ideals $\text{pt}(\text{Idl}(L))$. See [Joh82, Sec. II.3.3] for details.

By extension of Stone’s representation theorem, ringed lattices are equivalent to ringed coherent spaces. Sheaves on a topological space X are in bijection with sheaves on any basis of X by the comparison lemma for topological spaces. Hence, for any coherent space X we get an equivalence of categories

$$\mathbf{Sh}(\mathbf{K}^o(X)) \simeq \mathbf{Sh}(X)$$

Since the quasi-compact opens are all quasi-compact, we only have to consider finite covers for the sheaf property and we can thus identify $\mathbf{Sh}(\mathbf{K}^o(X))$ with the category of lattice sheaves on $\mathbf{K}^o(X)$.

However, in the locally ringed case things get a bit more complicated. In Definition 3.4 we had to add the invertibility map as an extra structure on the ringed lattice that could not be defined automatically. This is for the subtle reason that we required $\mathcal{D}_u(s)$ to be an element of the lattice. In other words, locally ringed lattices correspond to locally ringed spaces (X, \mathcal{O}_X) where X is a coherent space and *for any quasi-compact open $U \subseteq X$ and section $s : \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, the invertibility open $\mathcal{D}_U(s)$ is quasi-compact as well*. This last condition need not always hold, as the following counterexample due to Thierry Coquand shows:

Example 3.27. The one-point compactification of the naturals (as a discrete space) $X = \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ is coherent.²¹ Let $\mathcal{O}_X(U) = \{f : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{ continuous}\}$ and take the global section defined by $s(n) = 1/n$ and $s(\infty) = 0$. Then the invertibility open $\mathcal{D}_X(s) = \{x \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \mid s(x) \neq 0\} = \mathbb{N}$ is not compact. Hence we can not describe this locally ringed coherent space as a locally ringed lattice.

In the lingo of Grothendieck’s “EGA 1” [DG71], coherent spaces are precisely the qcqs-spaces which are sober. The technical notion of sobriety ensures that

²¹It is also Hausdorff and hence a Stone space, corresponding to the boolean algebra of finite and cofinite subsets of \mathbb{N} .

the points of a space can be recovered from the locale of opens and is crucial to make the representation theorem work. However, as schemes are always sober, qcqs-schemes are precisely the schemes with a coherent topology. Now, for a qcqs-scheme X , any quasi-compact open $U \subseteq X$ has a finite affine cover $U = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \text{Spec}(R_i)$. It follows that for any $s \in \mathcal{O}_X(U)$, its invertibility open can be computed as $\mathcal{D}_U(s) = \bigcup_{i=1}^n D(s|_{\text{Spec}(R_i)})$ and is thus quasi-compact.

Moreover, any morphism of schemes between two qcqs-schemes $X \rightarrow Y$ is coherent (quasi-compact). The key result [CLS09, Lemma 15]

If X is a qc- and Y a qs-scheme, then any morphism $X \rightarrow Y$ is quasi-compact.

is proved by combining several results from [DG71, Ch. 6].²² This shows that the category of locally ringed lattices contains qcqs-schemes as a full subcategory and that Definition 3.18 gives an equivalent description of this subcategory.

4 The functor of points approach

For algebraic geometers it is often convenient to identify a scheme with its “functor of points”.²³ Given a scheme X , we can look at the presheaf $\text{Sch}(_, X) : \text{Sch}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ and by the Yoneda lemma, two schemes X and Y are isomorphic as schemes if and only if the presheaves $\text{Sch}(_, X)$ and $\text{Sch}(_, Y)$ are naturally isomorphic. Since affine schemes form a dense subcategory of the category of schemes, X and Y are isomorphic schemes if the restrictions $\text{Sch}(_, X)|_{\text{Aff}^{op}}$ and $\text{Sch}(_, Y)|_{\text{Aff}^{op}}$ are isomorphic as presheaves. We can push this even further by using that the functor Spec is an equivalence of categories between Aff and CommRing^{op} . For any scheme X we can define its functor of points $h_X := \text{Sch}(\text{Spec}(_), X) : \text{CommRing} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ (a presheaf on CommRing^{op}) and two schemes are isomorphic if and only if their functors of points are naturally isomorphic. We can do this for our definition of qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices where a morphism of schemes is just a morphism of locally ringed lattices or equivalently a locally affine morphism of ringed lattices. We will study the functor of points for locally ringed lattices in Section 5.1.

In this section we want to answer the following question: Is it possible to characterize the image of the functor $h : \text{qcqsSch} \hookrightarrow \text{Psh}(\text{CommRing}^{op})$ directly, using purely algebraic and categorical methods, while staying constructive and predicative? In the classical literature, this is the so-called *functor of points approach*, which allows one to introduce schemes without having to introduce locally ringed spaces first. Affine schemes are readily accounted for in this approach, as they correspond to the *representable* presheaves given by the Yoneda embedding, which we will henceforth denote by $\text{Sp} : \text{CommRing}^{op} \hookrightarrow \text{Psh}(\text{CommRing}^{op})$. Indeed, one can immediately verify that $\text{Sp}(A) \cong h_{\text{Spec}(A)}$. Functorial schemes

²²In “The Rising Sea” this is proved using the so-called “cancellation theorem” [Vak24].

²³see e.g. [EH06, Ch. VI] or [Mum99, Ch. II §6].

turn out to be those presheaves $X : \mathbf{CommRing} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ that satisfy a certain locality condition and have an *open cover* by affine sub-presheaves $\mathbf{Sp}(A) \hookrightarrow X$.

The standard reference developing the basics of algebraic geometry starting from functors $\mathbf{CommRing} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ is “Introduction to Algebraic Geometry and Algebraic Groups” by Demazure and Gabriel [DG80]. The central notion here is that of an *open subfunctor*. These are in a certain sense classified by the locale of “Zariski opens”.²⁴ Focusing instead on the notion of *compact open subfunctors*, which are classified by the Zariski lattice, we can obtain a constructive functorial approach to qcqs-schemes. In this approach we have to be careful about size issues, so we will annotate categories with the universe level at which the type of objects live. Fixing a base level ℓ , $\mathbf{CommRing}_\ell$ will be the type or category of “small” commutative rings, whose carrier type lives in \mathbf{Type}_ℓ . Big commutative rings will be denoted by $\mathbf{CommRing}_{\ell+1}$ and the same applies to lattices, locally ringed lattices and the like.

Since it only requires standard tools from category theory and algebra, this approach lends itself to a concise definition of qcqs-schemes that is convenient to formalize. In particular, many of the definitions and results given in this section are formalized using the `Cubical Agda` proof assistant and are already described in [ZH24], which adapts [DG80] to HoTT/UF while staying constructive and predicative. We repeat definitions and results from [ZH24] here for convenience and for the sake of self-containedness but omit proofs.

Definition 4.1. The category of \mathbb{Z} -functors, denoted $\mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$, is the category of functors from $\mathbf{CommRing}_\ell$ to \mathbf{Set}_ℓ . We write $\mathbf{Sp} : \mathbf{CommRing}_\ell^{op} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ for the Yoneda embedding and $\mathbb{A}^1 : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ for the forgetful functor from commutative rings to sets. We say that $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ is an *affine scheme* if there exists a $R : \mathbf{CommRing}_\ell$ with a natural isomorphism $X \cong \mathbf{Sp}(R)$.²⁵

Example 4.2. \mathbb{A}^1 is an affine scheme, as $\mathbb{A}^1 \cong \mathbf{Sp}(\mathbb{Z}[x])$. The \mathbb{Z} -functor \mathbb{G}_m that sends a ring to its set of units, i.e. $\mathbb{G}_m(R) := R^\times$, is an affine scheme as $\mathbb{G}_m \cong \mathbf{Sp}(\mathbb{Z}[x][1/x])$.

Definition 4.3. Let $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$, the *ring of functions* $\mathcal{O}(X)$ is the type of natural transformations $X \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ equipped with the canonical point-wise operations, i.e. for $R : \mathbf{CommRing}_\ell$ and $x : X(R)$, zero, one, addition and multiplication are given by

$$\begin{aligned} 0_R(x) &::= 0, & 1_R(x) &::= 1 \\ (\alpha + \beta)_R(x) &::= \alpha_R(x) + \beta_R(x) \\ (\alpha \cdot \beta)_R(x) &::= \alpha_R(x) \cdot \beta_R(x) \end{aligned}$$

²⁴See e.g. [Mad13]. This fact is usually not stated explicitly in textbooks.

²⁵As the category of \mathbb{Z} -functors is univalent and \mathbf{Sp} is fully faithful, it is not necessary to use mere existence for defining affine schemes, as the type of rings R with $X \cong \mathbf{Sp}(R)$ is a proposition.

This defines a functor $\mathcal{O} : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell \rightarrow \text{CommRing}_{\ell+1}^{op}$, whose action on morphisms (natural transformations) is given by precomposition.

Because the ring of functions of a \mathbb{Z} -functor is lives in the successor universe, we cannot have an adjunction between Sp and \mathcal{O} . However, the two functors form what is called a *relative coadjunction* with respect to the functor induced by universe lifting $\text{lift} : \text{CommRing}_\ell^{op} \rightarrow \text{CommRing}_{\ell+1}^{op}$.

Definition 4.4 ([nLa24b]). Let $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be categories with functors $l : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, $F : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ and $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$. We say that F and G are l -relative adjoint, written as $G \dashv_l F$, if there is a natural family of equivalences

$$(c : \mathcal{C}) (b : \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(G(c), b) \simeq \mathcal{D}(l(c), F(b))$$

Dually, we say that F and G are l -relative coadjoint, written as $F \dashv_l G$, if there is a natural family of equivalences

$$(c : \mathcal{C}) (b : \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(F(b), l(c)) \simeq \mathcal{B}(b, G(c))$$

Remark 4.5. In the setting of Definition 4.4, a relative adjunction $G \dashv_l F$ induces a relative unit, i.e. for $c : \mathcal{C}$ a map $\eta_c : \mathcal{D}(l(c), F(G(c)))$ natural in c . Analogously, a relative coadjunction $F \dashv_l G$ induces a relative counit, i.e. for $c : \mathcal{C}$ a map $\varepsilon_c : \mathcal{D}(F(G(c)), l(c))$ natural in c . Note that we do not get the other direction in either case.

Proposition 4.6. *We have a relative coadjunction $\mathcal{O} \dashv_{\text{lift}} \text{Sp}$. In particular, for $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ there is an equivalence of types*

$$\text{Hom}(R, \mathcal{O}(X)) \simeq (X \Rightarrow \text{Sp}(R))$$

which is natural in both R and X . For any $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$, the relative counit $\varepsilon_R : \text{Hom}(R, \mathcal{O}(\text{Sp}(R)))$, which is obtained by applying the inverse of above isomorphism to the identity $\text{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow \text{Sp}(R)$, is an isomorphisms of rings.

Remark 4.7. Proposition 4.6 type-checks because the type of ring homomorphisms is universe polymorphic, meaning that it can take rings living in different universes as arguments. The same holds for the type of isomorphisms/equivalences between two types. Since universe lifting commutes with type formers, we get

$$\text{Hom}(R, \mathcal{O}(X)) \simeq \text{CommRing}_{\ell+1}^{op}(\mathcal{O}(X), \text{lift}(R))$$

which is natural in R and X . It is modulo this equivalence that we actually get the relative coadjunction $\mathcal{O} \dashv_{\text{lift}} \text{Sp}$ in Proposition 4.6.

4.1 Zariski coverage

The category of \mathbb{Z} -functors, contains a lot more than the functorial schemes we want to define. For example, for a qcqs-scheme X , we also have a functor mapping a ring A to the set $\text{RDL}^{op}(\text{Spec}(A), X)$ of morphisms of *ringed lattices* from

X to $\text{Spec}(A)$. This functor is of course of little interest to algebraic geometers and we need to set it apart from the functor of points $\text{LRDL}^{op}(\text{Spec}(_), X)$ by introducing a “locality” condition on \mathbb{Z} -functors. This condition is induced by a certain coverage or Grothendieck topology on $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{op}$, called the Zariski coverage or topology. Local \mathbb{Z} -functors turn out to be Zariski sheaves.

The notion of Grothendieck topology or coverage generalizes point-set topologies to arbitrary categories. It associates to each object in a category $X : \mathcal{C}$ a family $\text{Cov}(X)$ of covers, where a cover $\{f_i : \mathcal{C}(U_i, X)\}_{i:I}$ is a family of maps into X , i.e. a family of objects in the slice category \mathcal{C}/X . These $\text{Cov}(X)$ should satisfy certain closure properties. If \mathcal{C} has pullbacks, Cov should be closed under pullbacks, meaning that for $\{f_i : \mathcal{C}(U_i, Y)\}_{i:I}$ in $\text{Cov}(Y)$ and $g : \mathcal{C}(X, Y)$, the family $\{g^* f_i : \mathcal{C}(X \times_Y U_i, X)\}_{i:I}$ should be in $\text{Cov}(X)$. A presheaf $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{C}^{op} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ can then be defined to be a sheaf if for any $\{f_i : \mathcal{C}(U_i, X)\}_{i:I}$ in $\text{Cov}(X)$ we get an equalizer diagram

$$\mathcal{F}(X) \rightarrow \prod_{i:I} \mathcal{F}(U_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j:I} \mathcal{F}(U_i \times_X U_j) \quad (4.1)$$

In the case where \mathcal{C} is the poset of open subsets of a topological space X , covers are defined the usual way: A family $(U_i \subseteq U)_{i:I}$ is in $\text{Cov}(U)$ if $\bigcup_i U_i = U$. Pullbacks are just given by intersection and we recover the usual topological notion of sheaf.

Note that, while coverages are generally defined as pullback-stable families of covers, Grothendieck topologies require more closure properties and their covering families are usually required to be so-called sieves. Moreover, coverages can be defined on categories without pullbacks with a slightly weaker condition of “pullback stability”. Accordingly, the definition of sheaf with respect to such a generalized coverage is rephrased in a pullback-free way. For an overview of coverages with and without pullbacks and Grothendieck topologies see [nLa24a]. For a coverage (with or without pullbacks) one can always find a unique Grothendieck topology inducing the same notion of sheaf, by taking “closures” of covers in a certain sense.²⁶ Still, it is often convenient to work with concrete covers and not their generated sieves, as they give a simpler description of sheaves.

The formalization of functorial qcqs-schemes described in [ZH24] uses coverages without pullbacks, even though $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{op}$ has pullbacks (given by the tensor product of rings). This does seem to make certain things easier to formalize, as it requires less categorical machinery. For the sake of conceptual simplicity, however, we want to think of the specific coverage that we are interested in, the Zariski coverage, as pullback-stable families of covers on $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{op}$ with the corresponding notion of Zariski sheaf given as in (4.1). Consequently, results and proofs regarding the Zariski coverage are perhaps not as straightforwardly formalizable and may require careful rephrasing. Ultimately, this should

²⁶See e.g. [Joh02, Prop. C2.1.9].

always be possible as both coverages (with or without pullbacks) generate the same Grothendieck topology and thus give the same notion of Zariski sheaf.

Definition 4.8. For $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell^{\text{op}}$, a *Zariski cover* is indexed by finitely many elements $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ such that $1 \in \langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle$ and assigns to each f_i the canonical morphism $_{/1} : \text{CommRing}_\ell^{\text{op}}(R[1/f_i], R)$. This defines a coverage, called the *Zariski coverage*, as Lemma 4.9 shows. A \mathbb{Z} -functor is called *local* if it is a sheaf with respect to the Zariski coverage.

Lemma 4.9. *Zariski covers are stable under pullbacks.*

Proof. Let $R, A : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and $\varphi : \text{Hom}(R, A)$. For $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ with $1 \in \langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle$, we get that $1 \in \langle \varphi(f_1), \dots, \varphi(f_n) \rangle$ and this cover is indeed the pullback (in $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{\text{op}}$) of the Zariski cover on R , as we have a canonical isomorphism $A[1/\varphi(f_i)] \cong A \otimes_R R[1/f_i]$. \square

Theorem 4.10. *The Zariski coverage is subcanonical, meaning that $\text{Sp}(A)$ is local for $A : \text{CommRing}_\ell$.*

Proof. This is essentially the standard algebraic fact that is used to prove that the structure sheaf of an affine sheaf satisfies the sheaf property [EH06, Prop. I-18]: For $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ with $1 \in \langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle$ we have an equalizer diagram

$$R \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n R[1/f_i] \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} R[1/f_i f_j]$$

Since $R[1/f_i f_j] \cong R[1/f_i] \otimes_R R[1/f_j]$, i.e. $R[1/f_i f_j]$ is the pullback in $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{\text{op}}$, and $\text{Hom}(A, _)$ is left exact, the sheaf property (4.1) follows. For a formal proof for the Zariski coverage defined without using pullbacks, see [ZH24, Thm. 12]. \square

4.2 Compact opens

The main idea that allowed for a formalization of functorial qcqs-schemes in [ZH24] was a streamlined definition of compact open subfunctors of a \mathbb{Z} -functor. The compact open subfunctors are investigated extensively in the thesis of Blechschmidt [Ble21]. They play a prominent role in the development of synthetic algebraic geometry, i.e. algebraic geometry done internally in the topos of local \mathbb{Z} -functors, in the form of compact open propositions. Openness is usually defined as a property of a subfunctor $U \hookrightarrow X$. Recall that a subfunctor of a \mathbb{Z} -functor X is a \mathbb{Z} -functor U with a natural transformation $U \Rightarrow X$ that is pointwise injective. The property of being an open subfunctor can directly be restricted to compact openness as in [Ble21, Def. 19.15].

Definition 4.11. A subfunctor $U \hookrightarrow \text{Sp}(A)$ is an *affine open* subfunctor if there merely exists an ideal $I \subseteq A$ such that for any ring B we have

$$U(B) \cong \{ \varphi : \text{Hom}(A, B) \mid \varphi^* I = B \} \quad (4.2)$$

naturally and commuting with the embeddings into $\mathrm{Sp}(A)$. Here φ^*I is the ideal generated by the image of I under φ . We say that $U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(A)$ is an *affine compact open* subfunctor if there merely exists a *finitely generated* ideal $I \subseteq A$ such that we have an isomorphism of subobjects as in (4.2).

Remark 4.12. Note that the ideal I is not uniquely determined for an affine (compact) open subfunctor $U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Sp}(A)$. For ideals I, J of A we have that $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{J}$ if and only if for all rings B and $\varphi : \mathrm{Hom}(A, B)$ we have

$$\varphi^*I = B \Leftrightarrow \varphi^*J = B$$

If $I = \langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle$ is finitely generated, U is isomorphic (as subobjects) to the affine compact open subfunctor given by

$$B \mapsto \{ \varphi : \mathrm{Hom}(A, B) \mid 1 \in \langle \varphi(a_1), \dots, \varphi(a_n) \rangle \}$$

By the above argument it follows that this subfunctor is really determined by the element $D(a_1, \dots, a_n) : \mathcal{L}_A$, since for $J = \langle b_1, \dots, b_m \rangle$ we have

$$D(a_1, \dots, a_n) = D(b_1, \dots, b_m) \Leftrightarrow \sqrt{\langle a_1, \dots, a_n \rangle} = \sqrt{\langle b_1, \dots, b_m \rangle}$$

We can thus write the corresponding subfunctor as

$$B \mapsto \{ \varphi : \mathrm{Hom}(A, B) \mid D(1) = D(\varphi(a_1), \dots, \varphi(a_n)) \}$$

In other words the compact open subfunctors of the affine scheme $\mathrm{Sp}(A)$ are in bijection with elements of \mathcal{L}_A .

Definition 4.13. For \mathbb{Z} -functors $U \hookrightarrow X$, we say that U is a (*compact*) *open* subfunctor of X , if for any ring A and A -valued point of X , i.e. natural transformation $\phi : \mathrm{Sp}(A) \Rightarrow X$, the pullback $V := \mathrm{Sp}(A) \times_X U$ is an affine (compact) subfunctor:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \longrightarrow & U \\ \downarrow & \lrcorner & \downarrow \\ \mathrm{Sp}(A) & \xrightarrow{\phi} & X \end{array}$$

Remark 4.14. One easily checks that on $\mathrm{Sp}(A)$ compact open subfunctors and affine compact open subfunctors coincide.

One usually wants to identify subobjects up to natural isomorphism commuting with embeddings. This complicates things substantially in a formal setting. The key observation in [ZH24], allowing to circumvent this issue, is that the compact open subfunctors are classified by the Zariski lattice.

Definition 4.15. Let $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ be the \mathbb{Z} -functor mapping $R : \mathrm{CommRing}_\ell$ to the underlying set of the Zariski lattice \mathcal{L}_R . The action on morphisms is

induced by the universal property of the Zariski lattice, i.e. for $\varphi : \text{Hom}(A, B)$ we take

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & A & \\ D \swarrow & & \searrow D \circ \varphi \\ \mathcal{L}_A & \overset{\exists! \varphi^{\mathcal{L}}}{\dashrightarrow} & \mathcal{L}_B \end{array}$$

The transformation $D(1) : \mathbf{1} \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ from the terminal \mathbb{Z} -functor $\mathbf{1}(_) \equiv \{*\}$ to \mathcal{L} is the “pointwise constant” map $* \mapsto D(1)$.

Proposition 4.16. *For each presheaf with compact open subfunctor $U \hookrightarrow X$ there exists a unique natural transformation $\chi : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that the following is a pullback square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow D(1) \\ X & \xrightarrow{\exists! \chi} & \mathcal{L} \end{array}$$

Proof. For a ring A and an A -valued point of X , which modulo Yoneda we can write as $\phi : \text{Sp}(A) \Rightarrow X$, we can pull back U along ϕ to obtain an affine compact open subfunctor corresponding to a unique $u : \mathcal{L}_A$ and set $\chi(\phi) \equiv u$. This is well-defined by Remark 4.12 and easily seen to be natural in A . It also follows directly that this gives a pullback square. \square

Definition 4.17. Let $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$, a *compact open* of X is a natural transformation $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. The *realization* $\llbracket U \rrbracket : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ of a compact open U of X , is given by

$$\llbracket U \rrbracket(R) = \{x : X(R) \mid U(x) = D(1)\}$$

A compact open U is called *affine*, if its realization is affine, i.e. if there merely exists $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ such that $\llbracket U \rrbracket \cong \text{Sp}(R)$.

Remark 4.18. Indeed, one can check that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \llbracket U \rrbracket & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{1} \\ \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow D(1) \\ X & \xrightarrow{U} & \mathcal{L} \end{array}$$

Working with Definition 4.17 instead of Definition 4.13, can be seen as an instance of a common trick in constructive mathematics and type theory in particular. In order to avoid setoid or transport hell, when working with objects up to some non-trivial equivalence relation, one can instead use a suitable index set which is in bijection with the equivalence classes, and where each “index” corresponds to a canonical member of the corresponding equivalence class.

Definition 4.19. Let $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$, the *lattice of compact opens* $\text{CompOpen}(X)$ is the type $X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ equipped with the canonical point-wise operations, i.e. for $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and $x : X(R)$, top, bottom, join and meet are given by

$$\begin{aligned} 1_R(x) &= D(1), & 0_R(x) &= D(0) \\ (U \wedge V)_R(x) &= U_R(x) \wedge V_R(x) \\ (U \vee V)_R(x) &= U_R(x) \vee V_R(x) \end{aligned}$$

This defines a functor $\text{CompOpen} : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell \rightarrow \text{DistLattice}_{\ell+1}^{op}$.

Definition 4.20. Let $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ and $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. We say that the U_i form a *compact open cover* of X , if $1 = \bigvee_{i=1}^n U_i$ in the lattice $\text{CompOpen}(X)$.

Remark 4.21. Being able to define the notion of cover using the lattice structure on compact opens is one of the main advantages of using the internal Zariski lattice as a classifier. In the literature, the classically valid fact that $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ cover X if and only if $\bigcup_{i=1}^n \llbracket U_i \rrbracket(k) = X(k)$ for all fields k , is sometimes used as a definition for the notion of cover [EH06, Thm. VI-14]. As the notion of field is ambiguous from the constructive point of view, such a definition does not appear to be suitable for our purposes. The alternative of pulling back to affine compact opens and defining covers in terms of ideal addition does work, but Definition 4.20 streamlines this by making the occurrence of ideal addition implicit in the definition of the join operation on the Zariski lattice. This lets us define functorial qcqs-schemes.

Definition 4.22. $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ is a *qcqs-scheme* if it is a local \mathbb{Z} -functor and merely has an affine compact open cover, i.e. a compact open cover $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ such that each U_i is affine.

As an immediate sanity check we get that affine schemes are qcqs-schemes:

Proposition 4.23. $\text{Sp}(R)$ is a qcqs-scheme, for $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$.

Proof. [ZH24, Prop. 17] □

For locally ringed lattices we saw that qcqs-schemes are obtained by “gluing” together affine schemes in the sense that they are a colimit of affine subschemes of a certain shape. This holds for functorial qcqs-schemes as well, but only in the big Zariski topos, i.e. the category of local \mathbb{Z} -functors. The following lemma is taken from Nieper-Wiskirchen’s lecture notes [NW08] and adapted to our setting.

Lemma 4.24. Let X be a \mathbb{Z} -functor and $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be a compact open cover of X . Let Y be a local \mathbb{Z} -functor with morphisms $\alpha_i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket \Rightarrow Y$ for i in $1, \dots, n$ such that for every i, j the following square commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\llbracket U_i \wedge U_j \rrbracket & \hookrightarrow & \llbracket U_i \rrbracket \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_i \\
\llbracket U_j \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\alpha_j} & Y
\end{array}$$

Then there exists a unique $\alpha : X \Rightarrow Y$ such that for every i in $1, \dots, n$ the following triangle commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& X & \\
\swarrow & & \searrow \alpha \\
\llbracket U_i \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} & Y
\end{array}$$

Proof. First, we treat the case where $X = \mathbf{Sp}(R)$ is affine. Without loss of generality, we can assume that for every i in $1, \dots, n$, $U_i = D(f_i)$ is a basic open. Otherwise, we may use that, by Yoneda, we have a cover by basic opens $U_i = \bigvee_k D(f_{ik})$ and refine our cover accordingly. Note that the assumption of the lemma still holds for the refined cover. However, in the case of a cover by basic opens, α_i corresponds to an element of $Y(R[1/f_i])$ by Yoneda, and the lemma follows as Y was assumed local.

For the general case let $R : \mathbf{CommRing}_\ell$ and $x : X(R)$. By Yoneda we can regard the $U_i(x) : \mathcal{L}_R$ as a compact open cover of $\mathbf{Sp}(R)$. The α_i induce natural transformations $\llbracket U_i(x) \rrbracket \Rightarrow Y$, given on A -valued points by the function

$$\llbracket U_i(x) \rrbracket(A) = \{ \varphi : \mathbf{Hom}(R, A) \mid U_i(x \upharpoonright_\varphi) = D(1) \} \rightarrow Y(A)$$

mapping φ to $\alpha_i(x \upharpoonright_\varphi)$, where $x \upharpoonright_\varphi := X(\varphi)(x)$ is the restriction of x along φ . We can apply the above argument for the affine case to obtain a unique $\mathbf{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow Y$, which gives us the desired $\alpha(x) : Y(R)$. We omit the proof that this is natural and commutes with the α_i . \square

Corollary 4.25. *If $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ is a qcqs-scheme and $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ an (affine) compact open cover of X , then*

$$X \cong \text{colim} \{ \llbracket U_i \rrbracket \leftarrow \llbracket U_i \wedge U_j \rrbracket \rightarrow \llbracket U_j \rrbracket \}$$

in the category of local \mathbb{Z} -functors, i.e. Zariski sheaves. In particular, if we have $\llbracket U_i \rrbracket \cong \mathbf{Sp}(A_i)$, and affine compact open covers $(V_{ijk} : \llbracket U_i \wedge U_j \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L})_k$ with $\llbracket V_{ijk} \rrbracket \cong \mathbf{Sp}(A_{ijk})$, we have

$$X \cong \text{colim} \{ \mathbf{Sp}(A_i) \leftarrow \mathbf{Sp}(A_{ijk}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Sp}(A_j) \}$$

4.3 Open subschemes

Let us conclude this section by proving that compact opens of qcqs-schemes are qcqs-schemes. The special case of compact opens of affine schemes is formalized in [ZH24]. First, we treat locality.

Lemma 4.26. \mathcal{L} is local.

Proof. For $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ with $1 \in \langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle$, we get $D(1) = D(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ in \mathcal{L}_R . By the “gluing lemma for distributive lattices” [CLS07, Lemma 5] we get an equalizer diagram

$$\mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \downarrow D(f_i) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \downarrow D(f_i f_j)$$

Now, for i, j in $1, \dots, n$ let $\psi_i : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} \cong \downarrow D(f_i)$ and $\psi_{ij} : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i f_j]} \cong \downarrow D(f_i f_j)$ be the respective isomorphisms given by Lemma 2.4. The following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_i]{\cong} & \downarrow D(f_i) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \wedge^{D(f_j)} \\ \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i f_j]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_{ij}]{\cong} & \downarrow D(f_i f_j) \end{array}$$

giving us an equalizer diagram

$$\mathcal{L}_R \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i f_j]}$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.27. The realization $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ of a compact open $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ of a local \mathbb{Z}_ℓ -functor X is local.

Proof. [ZH24, Lemma 21]. Note that this proof uses the fact that \mathcal{L} is separated wrt. the Zariski coverage. This follows from Lemma 4.26, as sheaves are always separated. Alternatively, see [ZH24, Lemma 20] for a direct proof. \square

It remains to prove that compact opens of qcqs-schemes merely have an affine cover. Compact opens of affine schemes can be covered by “basic opens”, as was shown in [ZH24].

Definition 4.28. Let $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and $f : R$, the standard open $D(f) : \text{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is given by applying the Yoneda lemma to the basic open $D(f) : \mathcal{L}_R$.

Lemma 4.29. For $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and $f : R$, the standard open $D(f)$ is affine. In particular one has a natural isomorphism $\llbracket D(f) \rrbracket \cong \text{Sp}(R[1/f])$.

Proof. [ZH24, Prop. 23] \square

Lemma 4.30. For any ring $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$, the realization $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ of a compact open $U : \text{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ is a qcqs-scheme.

Proof. [ZH24, Thm. 24] \square

Now we want to generalize this to the case of a compact open of an arbitrary qcqs-scheme. The key result is the following lemma that will play an important role later on as well.

Lemma 4.31. *For any \mathbb{Z} -functor X and $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, we have an isomorphism of lattices*

$$\psi_U : \mathbf{CompOpen}(\llbracket U \rrbracket) \cong \downarrow U$$

that preserves realizations, i.e. $\llbracket V \rrbracket \cong \llbracket \psi_U(V) \rrbracket$ naturally for $V : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$.

Proof. Constructing the inverse map $\psi_U^{-1} : \downarrow U \rightarrow (\llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L})$ is actually the straightforward part. We have a map

$$(X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow (\llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L})$$

which is given as follows: For $V : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ we compose with the canonical inclusion $i_U : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow X$, i.e. take $V \circ i_U$. Note that we have $V \circ i_U = (U \wedge V) \circ i_U$. We can then take ψ_U^{-1} to be the restriction of this map to $\downarrow U$, which clearly is a lattice morphism. We also get that $\llbracket V \rrbracket \cong \llbracket \psi_U^{-1}(V) \rrbracket$ for $V \leq U$, as for any ring R and point $x : X(R)$, $V(x) = D(1)$ implies $U(x) = D(1)$.

To construct ψ_U let $V : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, R a ring and $x : X(R)$. Assume that we have $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ such that $U(x) = D(f_1, \dots, f_n)$. Let $x_i := X(-/1)(x) : X(R[1/f_i])$ be the restriction of x along the canonical $-/1 : R \rightarrow R[1/f_i]$, where i in $1, \dots, n$. Now, $U(x_i) = D(1)$ and we may apply V to x_i , giving us $V(x_i) : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]}$. Using the isomorphisms $\psi_{f_i} : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} \cong \downarrow D(f_i)$ from Lemma 2.4, we get $\psi_{f_i}(V(x_i)) : \downarrow D(f_i)$ for each i in $1, \dots, n$. We want to set

$$\psi_U(V)(x) := \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}(V(x_i)) \leq U(x)$$

but we need to check that this is well-defined, i.e. independent of the choice of the f_i . So let $g_1, \dots, g_m : R$ be such that $D(f_1, \dots, f_n) = D(g_1, \dots, g_m) = U(x)$. For i in $1, \dots, n$ and j in $1, \dots, m$, let $x_{ij} : X(R[1/f_i g_j])$ be the restriction of x along $-/1 : R \rightarrow R[1/f_i g_j]$ and $\psi_{f_i g_j} : \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i g_j]} \cong \downarrow D(f_i g_j)$ be the corresponding isomorphism given by Lemma 2.4. For the canonical map $\gamma_{ij} : R[1/f_i] \rightarrow R[1/f_i g_j]$ we get that the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_{f_i}]{\cong} & \downarrow D(f_i) \\ \gamma_{ij}^{\mathcal{L}} \downarrow & & \downarrow - \wedge D(g_j) \\ \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i g_j]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_{f_i g_j}]{\cong} & \downarrow D(f_i g_j) \end{array}$$

Moreover, we get $\gamma_{ij}^{\mathcal{L}}(V(x_i)) = V(x_{ij})$ by the naturality of X and V . This gives us

$$\psi_{f_i}(V(x_i)) = \bigvee_{j=1}^m (\psi_{f_i}(V(x_i)) \wedge D(g_j)) = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \psi_{f_i g_j}(V(x_{ij}))$$

Repeating the above argument with i and j swapped shows well-definedness:

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}(V(x_i)) = \bigvee_{i,j} \psi_{f_i g_j}(V(x_{ij})) = \bigvee_{j=1}^m \psi_{g_j}(V(x_j))$$

To show the naturality of this construction, take $\varphi : \mathbf{Hom}(R, A)$ and $x : X(R)$ with its restriction along φ denoted $x \upharpoonright_{\varphi} \equiv X(\varphi)(x)$. Since we have to prove a proposition, we can assume that we have $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ such that $U(x) = D(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ and thus $\psi_U(V)(x) = \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}(V(x_i))$, with x_i defined as above for i in $1, \dots, n$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{\mathcal{L}}(\psi_U(V)(x)) &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \varphi^{\mathcal{L}}(\psi_{f_i}(V(x_i))) \\ &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}((\varphi/1)^{\mathcal{L}}(V(x_i))) \\ &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{\varphi(f_i)}(V(x \upharpoonright_{\varphi/1})) \\ &= \psi_U(V)(x \upharpoonright_{\varphi}) \end{aligned}$$

Here $x \upharpoonright_{\varphi/1}$ is the restriction along the canonical $\varphi/1 : R \rightarrow A[1/\varphi(f_i)]$ for each respective i in $1, \dots, n$. The second equality above holds because the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{L}_{R[1/f_i]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_{f_i}]{\cong} & \downarrow D(f_i) \\ (\varphi/1)^{\mathcal{L}} \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi^{\mathcal{L}} \\ \mathcal{L}_{A[1/\varphi(f_i)]} & \xrightarrow[\psi_{\varphi(f_i)}]{\cong} & \downarrow D(\varphi(f_i)) \end{array}$$

The last equality holds since $U(x \upharpoonright_{\varphi}) = D(\varphi(f_1), \dots, \varphi(f_n))$. This finishes the proof that $\psi_U(V)$ is a natural transformation. We omit the proof that ψ_U is inverse to ψ_U^{-1} . \square

Lemma 4.32. *Let X be \mathbb{Z} -functor and $U, V : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be compact opens. If both $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket V \rrbracket$ merely have an affine cover, then $\llbracket U \vee V \rrbracket$ merely has an affine cover.*

Proof. Let $U_1, \dots, U_n : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and $V_1, \dots, V_m : \llbracket V \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be affine covers of $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket V \rrbracket$ respectively. Using the isomorphisms ψ_U and ψ_V given by applying Lemma 4.31 to U and V , we get compact opens $\psi_U(U_i)$ and $\psi_V(V_j)$ of X that are affine and cover $U \vee V$, i.e.

$$\left(\bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_U(U_i) \right) \vee \left(\bigvee_{j=1}^m \psi_V(V_j) \right) = U \vee V$$

Using Lemma 4.31 for $U \vee V$, we get that the $\psi_{U \vee V}^{-1}(\psi_U(U_i))$ and $\psi_{U \vee V}^{-1}(\psi_V(V_j))$ together give an affine cover of $\llbracket U \vee V \rrbracket$. \square

Theorem 4.33. *The realization $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ of a compact open $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ of a qcqs-scheme X is a qcqs-scheme.*

Proof. $\llbracket U \rrbracket$ is local by Lemma 4.27. To show that it has an affine cover, let $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ be an affine cover of X . For i in $1, \dots, n$, the compact open $\psi_{U_i}^{-1}(U \wedge U_i)$ of $\llbracket U_i \rrbracket$ has an affine cover by Lemma 4.30.²⁷ As explained in the proof of Lemma 4.31, we get natural isomorphisms of \mathbb{Z} -functors

$$\llbracket \psi_{U_i}^{-1}(U \wedge U_i) \rrbracket \cong \llbracket U \wedge U_i \rrbracket \cong \llbracket \psi_U^{-1}(U \wedge U_i) \rrbracket$$

which can be made into equalities of \mathbb{Z} -functors, as categories of functors into a univalent category are always univalent. We can transport the property of having an affine cover along these equalities, giving us that each $\psi_U^{-1}(U \wedge U_i)$ (a compact open of $\llbracket U \rrbracket$) has an affine cover. We can then iterate Lemma 4.32 to obtain an affine cover of $\llbracket U \rrbracket$. \square

5 Equivalence of approaches

Having given two constructive definitions of qcqs-scheme, we want show that these two notions coincide. The proof strategy is mostly analogous to that of the classical *comparison theorem* given by Demazure and Gabriel [DG80, Ch. I, §1, no 4.4]. We construct an adjunction between \mathbb{Z} -functors and the opposite category of locally ringed lattices. For proving properties of the left adjoint that “realizes” a \mathbb{Z} -functor as a locally ringed lattice (in particular Proposition 5.19 and Proposition 5.20), we take inspiration from the lecture notes of Nieper-Wißkirchen [NW08]. The notes often include concrete computations that can be constructivized even when being explicit about universe levels. Technically, the purported adjunction will be a coadjunction relative to universe lifting, as in Proposition 4.6. We then show that when restricted to the respective full subcategories of qcqs-schemes, this becomes an equivalence of categories. In order to dispose of relativity with respect to universe lifting, we use univalence.

5.1 Functor of points of a locally ringed lattice

Developing scheme theory starting from \mathbb{Z} -functors is an exception rather than norm in the introductory literature on algebraic geometry. Most often schemes are defined as locally ringed spaces and in a second step they are assigned a \mathbb{Z} -functor, called the functor of points of a scheme or locally ringed space.²⁸ We can do the same for locally ringed lattices. In this section we want to define the functor of points for locally ringed lattices and prove some basic properties for the functor of points of a qcqs-scheme. In order to avoid confusion, we will henceforth use qcqs-scheme only for lattice-theoretic qcqs-schemes and speak of functorial qcqs-schemes otherwise.

²⁷For $\llbracket U_i \rrbracket \cong \mathbf{Sp}(A_i)$, one may think of $\psi_{U_i}^{-1}(U \wedge U_i)$ as representing the compact open subscheme $\llbracket U \wedge U_i \rrbracket \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Sp}(A_i)$.

²⁸See e.g. [EH06, Ch. 6] for an in-depth discussion in a classical source.

Definition 5.1. The *functor of points* associated to a locally ringed lattice $X := (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is the \mathbb{Z} -functor given by

$$h_X := \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(_), X)$$

This defines a functor $\text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ where the action on morphisms is given point-wise by post-composition.

Lemma 5.2. *The functor of points h_X of a locally ringed lattice X is local.*

Proof. Let $f_1, \dots, f_n : R$ be such that $1 \in \langle f_1, \dots, f_n \rangle$. Since $\text{Spec}(R) \upharpoonright_{D(f_i)} \cong \text{Spec}(R[1/f_i])$ as locally ringed lattices [CLS09, Ex. 1], we get by Proposition 3.20 that in LRDL^{op}

$$\text{Spec}(R) \cong \text{colim} \{ \text{Spec}(R[1/f_i]) \leftarrow \text{Spec}(R[1/f_i f_j]) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R[1/f_j]) \}$$

Thus the following is an equalizer diagram

$$h_X(R) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n h_X(R[1/f_i]) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} h_X(R[1/f_i f_j])$$

which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 5.3. *$h_{\text{Spec}(R)}$ is naturally isomorphic to $\text{Sp}(R)$.*

Proof. Spec is fully faithful. □

Lemma 5.4. *For a locally ringed lattice $X := (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we have a lattice homomorphism $\varepsilon^* : L_X \rightarrow \text{CompOpen}(h_X)$ such that for each $u : L_X$ we get a natural isomorphism $\llbracket \varepsilon^*(u) \rrbracket \cong h_{X \upharpoonright_u}$.²⁹*

Proof. Let $u : L_X$. For a ring R and $\pi : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(R), X)$ we can define a compact open by setting $\varepsilon^*(u)_R(\pi) := \pi^*(u)$. This clearly defines a morphism of lattices. Moreover, this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \llbracket \varepsilon^*(u) \rrbracket(R) &\simeq \{ \pi : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(R), X) \mid \pi^*(u) = D(1) \} \\ &\simeq \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(R), X \upharpoonright_u) \end{aligned}$$

where the second equivalence is given composition with the “inclusion” $(_ \wedge u) : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(X \upharpoonright_u, X)$. We omit the proof that this is natural in R . □

Lemma 5.5. *If $X := (L_X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a qcqs-scheme, then h_X is a functorial qcqs-scheme.*

²⁹This ε^* turns out to be the lattice morphism corresponding to the relative counit induced by Proposition 5.20, hence the name. We will not use this fact explicitly, however.

Proof. By Lemma 5.2, X is local. Assume that $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$ is an affine cover with $X \downarrow_{u_i} \cong \text{Spec}(R_i)$ as locally ringed lattices. Then the $\varepsilon^*(u_i)$ cover h_X and are affine as

$$\llbracket \varepsilon^*(u) \rrbracket \cong h_{X \downarrow_{u_i}} \cong h_{\text{Spec}(R_i)} \cong \text{Sp}(R_i)$$

By Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.3 □

This allows us to regard $h_{(_)} :$ as a functor $\text{QcQsSch}_\ell \rightarrow \text{FunQcQsSch}_\ell$. This restricted functor of points functor is fully faithful.

Proposition 5.6. *The functor $h_{(_)} : \text{QcQsSch}_\ell \rightarrow \text{FunQcQsSch}_\ell$ is fully faithful.*

Proof. Let X, Y be qcqs-schemes and let $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$ be an affine cover with $X \downarrow_{u_i} \cong \text{Spec}(R_i)$. By Lemma 4.24, any $\alpha : h_X \Rightarrow h_Y$ is uniquely determined by the induced restrictions $\alpha_i : (\llbracket \varepsilon^*(u_i) \rrbracket \Rightarrow h_Y)$. Combining the proof of Lemma 5.5 with Yoneda and our assumptions, we get a chain of equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} (\llbracket \varepsilon^*(u_i) \rrbracket \Rightarrow h_Y) &\simeq (\text{Sp}(R_i) \Rightarrow h_Y) \\ &\simeq \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(R_i), Y) \simeq \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(X \downarrow_{u_i}, Y) \end{aligned}$$

Now, let $\pi_i : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(X \downarrow_{u_i}, Y)$ be the morphism that we obtain by applying the chain of equivalences to α_i . By Proposition 3.20, the π_i determine a $\pi : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(X, Y)$. Cumbersome computations reveal that modulo precomposition with the natural isomorphism $\llbracket \varepsilon^*(u_i) \rrbracket \cong h_{X \downarrow_{u_i}}$, given by Lemma 5.4, h_{π_i} is just α_i . Hence, π is unique such that $h_\pi = \alpha$. □

5.2 Geometric realization of a \mathbb{Z} -functor

We have seen that to a \mathbb{Z} -functor X we can assign a (big) distributive lattice. We can actually make this into a locally ringed lattice that on representables $\text{Sp}(R)$ is just $\text{Spec}(R)$, modulo universe lifting.

Definition 5.7. For a presheaf X , the locally ringed lattice $|X| : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$ is the lattice $L_{|X|} := \text{CompOpen}(X)$ with a sheaf $\mathcal{O}_{|X|}$ assigning to each $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ the ring of functions $\llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ on U 's realization, i.e.

$$\mathcal{O}_{|X|}(U) := \mathcal{O}(\llbracket U \rrbracket)$$

The invertibility support on $(\text{CompOpen}(X), \mathcal{O}_{|X|})$ is given as follows: For a compact open $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and function $s : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ we get a natural transformation $U_s : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, which for $x : X(R)$ with $U(x) = D(1)$ is given by $U_s(x) := D(s(x))$. By Lemma 4.31 this corresponds to a compact open in $\downarrow U$, i.e. we can define

$$\mathcal{D}_U(s) := \psi_U(U_s)$$

For a natural transformation $\alpha : X \Rightarrow Y$ we get a morphism of locally ringed lattices $|\alpha| : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}(|X|, |Y|)$ as follows: The lattice morphism $|\alpha|^*$ acts on compact opens by precomposition with α . For $U : Y \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, we get a canonical transformation $\alpha|_U : \llbracket U \circ \alpha \rrbracket \Rightarrow \llbracket U \rrbracket$ and we can define

$$|\alpha|_U^\sharp := (_ \circ \alpha|_U) : \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}_{|Y|}(U), \mathcal{O}_{|X|}(\underbrace{U \circ \alpha}_{\equiv |\alpha|^*(U)}))$$

This defines the desired natural transformation $|\alpha|^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_{|Y|} \Rightarrow |\alpha|_* \mathcal{O}_{|X|}$. The functor $|_| : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell \rightarrow \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}$ is called the *geometric realization functor*.

There are several things to check in order to show that the above is a sensible definition. Apart from various functoriality, naturality and homomorphism conditions, we have to check the following four lemmas.

Lemma 5.8. *For any \mathbb{Z} -functor X , $\mathcal{O}_{|X|}$ is a sheaf on the lattice $\text{CompOpen}(X)$.*

Proof. For $U = \bigvee_{i=1}^n U_i$, we get a cover of $\text{CompOpen}(\llbracket U \rrbracket)$ by the compact opens $\psi_U^{-1}(U_i)$. Since \mathbb{A}^1 is affine and hence local, we can use Lemma 4.24 to see that any function $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket U \rrbracket)$ is uniquely determined by its restriction to the $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket \psi_U^{-1}(U_i) \rrbracket) \cong \mathcal{O}(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket)$. This means that we have an equalizer diagram

$$\mathcal{O}(\llbracket U \rrbracket) \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket) \rightrightarrows \prod_{i,j} \mathcal{O}(\llbracket U_i \wedge U_j \rrbracket)$$

which finishes the proof. \square

Lemma 5.9. *For any \mathbb{Z} -functor X , compact open $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and function $s : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$, $\mathcal{D}_U(s)$ is an invertibility supremum in $\downarrow U$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.31, it suffices to check that U_s is the largest element of $\text{CompOpen}(\llbracket U \rrbracket)$ where (the restriction of) s becomes invertible. This follows immediately from the fact that, for $x : X(R)$ with $U(x) = D(1)$, we have $U_s(x) \equiv D(s(x)) = D(1)$ if and only if $s(x) \in R^\times$. \square

Lemma 5.10. *For any \mathbb{Z} -functor X and compact open $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, \mathcal{D}_U is a support.*

Proof. Again by Lemma 4.31, it suffices to verify that

$$U_{(_)} : (\llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1) \rightarrow (\llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathcal{L})$$

is a support. This can be checked point-wise. For example, $U_{s+t} \leq U_s \vee U_t$ follows from the fact that $D(s(x) + t(x)) \leq D(s(x)) \vee D(t(x))$ for $x : X(R)$ with $U(x) = D(1)$. \square

Lemma 5.11. *For a natural transformation $\alpha : X \Rightarrow Y$, the realization $|\alpha|$ is a morphism of locally ringed lattices, i.e. for a compact open $U : Y \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ and function $s : \llbracket U \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ we have*

$$|\alpha|^*(\mathcal{D}_U(s)) = \mathcal{D}_{|\alpha|^*(U)}(|\alpha|^\sharp(s))$$

Proof. Unfolding the definition of $|\alpha|$, we have to show that $\psi_U(U_s) \circ \alpha$ is equal to $\psi_{U \circ \alpha}((U \circ \alpha)_{s \circ \alpha}|_U)$ as a natural transformation $X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. Applying either natural transformation to $x : X(R)$ with $U(\alpha(x)) = D(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ computes to the same value in \mathcal{L}_R , namely $\bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}(D(s(\alpha(x_i))))$, where $x_i : X(R[1/f_i])$ is the canonical restriction and ψ_{f_i} is given by Lemma 2.4. This proves the desired equality. \square

Now, let $\text{lift} : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$ be the functor that is induced by universe lifting. Note that this overload of notation, with lift being the operation on universes as well as the induced functor for rings and locally ringed lattices, is justified by the fact that lifting commutes with all the type formers. This is used in the following lemma, which is needed to prove that the realization of a functorial qcqs-scheme is a (big) qcqs-scheme.

Lemma 5.12. *We have $|\text{Sp}(R)| \cong \text{lift}(\text{Spec}(R)) \cong \text{Spec}(\text{lift}(R))$ in $\text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$, for any $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$.*

Lemma 5.13. *For $U : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, we have $|X| \upharpoonright_U \cong \llbracket U \rrbracket$ in $\text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$.*

Proof. Follows directly from Lemma 4.31. \square

Corollary 5.14. *If X is a functorial qcqs-scheme, then $|X|$ is a qcqs-scheme in $\text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$.*

Realizations of functorial qcqs-schemes are not just any kind of big qcqs-scheme, they admit a cover by small affine schemes.

Definition 5.15. We say that $X : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}$ is an *essentially small* qcqs-scheme, if there merely exists a cover $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$ together with small rings $R_1, \dots, R_n : \text{CommRing}_\ell$ and isomorphisms $X \upharpoonright_{u_i} \cong \text{Spec}(\text{lift}(R_i))$.

Corollary 5.16. *If X is a functorial qcqs-scheme, then $|X|$ is an essentially small qcqs-scheme.*

Lemma 5.17. *For $X : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}$ an essentially small qcqs-scheme there exists a small scheme $Y : \text{QcQsSch}_\ell$ with $X \cong \text{lift}(Y)$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.20 and the fact that the functor lift preserves colimits. \square

Remark 5.18. Note that we did not require *mere* existence of an essentially small scheme in Lemma 5.17. This is because the Σ -type of $Y : \text{QcQsSch}_\ell$ with

an isomorphism $X \cong \text{lift}(Y)$ is a proposition, since locally ringed lattices form a univalent category by Proposition 3.7 and lift is fully faithful. In other words, Lemma 5.17 allows us to *choose* an isomorphic small scheme for each essentially small scheme. This choice can even be made functorial by invoking the chosen isomorphisms, giving us a *functor* from essentially small to small schemes.³⁰ This functor appears implicitly in the proof of Theorem 5.22.

Proposition 5.19. *The functor $|-| : \text{FunnQcQsSch}_\ell \rightarrow \text{QcQsSch}_{\ell+1}$ is fully faithful.*

Proof. Let X, Y be functorial qcqs-schemes. Any $\pi : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X|, |Y|)$ is locally a morphism of small affine schemes in the following sense: There merely exist compatible affine compact open covers $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\llbracket U_i \rrbracket \cong \text{Sp}(A_i)$ and $V_1, \dots, V_m : Y \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\llbracket V_j \rrbracket \cong \text{Sp}(B_j)$, where the A_i and B_j are small rings. Compatibility means that for each U_i exists a V_j such that $U_i \leq \pi^*(V_j)$ and the “restriction” $\pi \upharpoonright_{U_i} : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X| \upharpoonright_{U_i}, |Y| \upharpoonright_{V_j})$ is induced by a ring morphism $\varphi_{ij} : \text{Hom}(B_j, A_i)$. This means that $\text{lift}(\varphi_{ij})$ agrees with $\pi^\# \upharpoonright_{U_i} : \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(\llbracket V_j \rrbracket), \mathcal{O}(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket))$, modulo the canonical $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket V_j \rrbracket) \cong \text{lift}(B_j)$ and $\mathcal{O}(\llbracket U_i \rrbracket) \cong \text{lift}(A_i)$ given by Proposition 4.6, and that by applying Spec to this morphism we recover $\pi \upharpoonright_{U_i}$. Note that such φ_{ij} exist since lift is fully faithful.

The morphism φ_{ij} induces a natural transformation $\alpha_i : \llbracket U_i \rrbracket \Rightarrow \llbracket V_j \rrbracket \Rightarrow Y$, which we can glue to an $\alpha : X \Rightarrow Y$ by Lemma 4.24. Cumbersome computations show that, modulo the equivalence $|X| \upharpoonright_{U_i} \cong \llbracket U_i \rrbracket$ of Lemma 5.13, $|\alpha_i|$ is just $(- \wedge V_j) \circ \pi \upharpoonright_{U_i} : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X| \upharpoonright_{U_i}, |Y|)$, as both maps are induced by φ_{ij} . In other words, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
|X| \upharpoonright_{U_i} & \xrightarrow{\pi \upharpoonright_{U_i}} & |Y| \upharpoonright_{V_j} & \xrightarrow{- \wedge V_j} & |Y| \\
\wr \downarrow & & \downarrow \wr & & \parallel \\
\text{Spec}(\text{lift}(A_i)) & \xrightarrow{\text{Spec}(\text{lift}(\varphi_{ij}))} & \text{Spec}(\text{lift}(B_j)) & & \\
\wr \downarrow & & \downarrow \wr & & \parallel \\
\llbracket U_i \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \llbracket V_j \rrbracket & \xrightarrow{\quad} & |Y| \\
& & \searrow & \nearrow & \\
& & & |\alpha_i| &
\end{array}$$

This shows that α is the unique natural transformation such that $|\alpha| = \pi$. \square

5.3 Comparison theorem

Morally, the functor of points and the geometric realization functor give us an equivalence of the two notions of qcqs-scheme. However, in our setting they only form a relative coadjunction.

Proposition 5.20. $|-| \dashv_{\text{lift}} h$.

³⁰This is basically the trick used in the proof of [Uni13, Lemma 9.4.5].

Proof. Let $X : \mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_\ell$ and $Y : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}$. We give a bijection

$$_{}^{\flat} : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X|, \text{lift}(Y)) \cong (X \Rightarrow h_Y)$$

For the left to right direction, let $\pi : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X|, \text{lift}(Y))$ be a morphism of (big) locally ringed lattices. For a R -valued point $\alpha : \text{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow X$ we take its geometric realization and compose with π to get $|\alpha| \circ \pi : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|\text{Sp}(R)|, \text{lift}(Y))$. By Lemma 5.12 and the properties of lift , we get a chain of equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|\text{Sp}(R)|, \text{lift}(Y)) &\cong \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(\text{lift}(R)), \text{lift}(Y)) \\ &\cong \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}(\text{Spec}(R), Y) \end{aligned}$$

Applying these equivalences to $|\alpha| \circ \pi$ gives the desired morphism $\pi^{\flat}(\alpha) : h_Y(R)$. This is immediately seen to be natural in R , i.e. define the required natural transformation.

Now, let $\alpha : X \Rightarrow h_Y$ be a natural transformation. We need to define a morphism of locally ringed lattices $\pi := (\pi^*, \pi^\sharp) : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X|, \text{lift}(Y))$. Let $u : L_Y$, this defines a natural transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_u : h_Y &\Rightarrow \mathcal{L} \\ \theta_u(\rho^*, \rho^\sharp) &:= \rho^*(u) \end{aligned}$$

We can then set $\pi^*(u) := \theta_u \circ \alpha : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$. We now need to provide a morphism of rings $\pi^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_Y(u) \rightarrow (\llbracket \pi^*(u) \rrbracket \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1)$. So let us fix $s : \mathcal{O}_Y(u)$ and $x : X(A)$ such that $\theta_u(\alpha(x)) \equiv \alpha(x)^*(u) = D(1)$. This means that we have a morphism

$$\alpha(x)^\sharp : \mathcal{O}_Y(u) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_A(D(1)) \quad (= A)$$

which, modulo the above identification, lets us define $\pi^\sharp(s)(x) := \alpha(x)^\sharp(s)$. We omit the proof that this is a ring homomorphism natural in A . In order to check that π is a morphism of locally ringed lattices, let $u : L_Y$ and $s : \mathcal{O}_Y(u)$. We need give an equality of natural transformations $X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$, so let $x : X(R)$ be given such that $\alpha(x)^*(u) = D(f_1, \dots, f_n)$. We get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s))(x) &= \alpha(x)^*(\mathcal{D}_u(s)) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\alpha(x)^*(u)}(\alpha(x)^\sharp(s)) \\ &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \mathcal{D}_{D(f_i)}(\alpha(x)^\sharp(s)|_{D(f_i)}) \\ &= \bigvee_{i=1}^n \psi_{f_i}(D(\alpha(x_i)^\sharp(s))) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{\pi^*(u)}(\pi^\sharp(s))(x) \end{aligned}$$

where $x_i : X(R[1/f_i])$ is the canonical restriction and ψ_{f_i} is given by Lemma 2.4. We omit the proof that this is inverse to $_{}^{\flat}$. \square

Corollary 5.21. *For a functorial qcqs-scheme X and $Y : \text{LRDL}_\ell^{\text{op}}$, the map*

$$_{}^{\flat} : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{\text{op}}(|X|, \text{lift}(Y)) \rightarrow (X \Rightarrow h_Y)$$

given in the proof of Proposition 5.20, maps isomorphisms of ringed lattices to natural isomorphisms.

Proof. Let $\pi : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}(|X|, \text{lift}(Y))$ be an isomorphism of locally ringed lattices and $R : \text{CommRing}_\ell$. Since $|_$ is fully faithful on functorial qcqs-schemes by Proposition 5.19, the map

$$|_ \circ \pi : (\text{Sp}(R) \Rightarrow X) \rightarrow \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}(|\text{Sp}(R)|, \text{lift}(Y))$$

is a bijection. \square

Theorem 5.22. *We have an adjoint equivalence of categories between functorial and geometrical qcqs-schemes.*

Proof. Since locally ringed lattices and \mathbb{Z} -functors form univalent categories (Proposition 3.7 and [Uni13, Thm. 9.2.5]), it suffices by [Uni13, Lemma 9.4.7] to show that $h_{(_)} : \text{QcQsSch}_\ell \rightarrow \text{FunQcQsSch}_\ell$ is fully faithful and essentially surjective. Fully faithfulness was already proved in Proposition 5.6. Let X be a functorial qcqs-scheme. Looking at the proof of Corollary 5.14, we can see that $|X|$ is an essentially small scheme. By Lemma 5.17, we can thus assume the existence of a $Y : \text{QcQsSch}_\ell$ with an isomorphism $|X| \cong \text{lift}(Y)$. Using Corollary 5.21 this gives us the desired natural isomorphism $X \cong h_Y$. \square

Remark 5.23. We want to conclude this section with a comparison of our approach with the presentation in [DG80]. Demazure and Gabriel assume two Grothendieck universes and define \mathbb{Z} -functors to map small rings to big sets. To model this situation in our setting, assume cumulative universes $\text{Type}_\ell : \text{Type}_{\ell+1}$ and define \mathbb{Z} -functors to be functors $\text{CommRing}_\ell \rightarrow \text{Set}_{\ell+1}$. The spectrum $\text{Sp}(A) := \text{Hom}(A, _)$ can then even be defined for big $A : \text{CommRing}_{\ell+1}$. Note however, that this Sp is only fully faithful when restricted to $\text{CommRing}_\ell^{op}$. This caveat and the fact that universes are simply not cumulative in `Cubical Agda`, led the formalization [ZH24] to deviate from [DG80]. We decided to follow the formalization here, as one of the main objectives was to develop a univalent and constructive theory of schemes that can be formalized in e.g. `Cubical Agda`.

The advantage of the approach of [DG80] is that it allows one to avoid relative coadjunctions. The “big spectrum functor” Sp is right adjoint to \mathcal{O} . Similarly, we can define the functor of points

$$h_X := \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}(\text{Spec}(_), X) : \text{CommRing}_\ell \rightarrow \text{Set}_{\ell+1}$$

for any big $X : \text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}$ and we get an adjunction $|_ \dashv h$. We can then show that this becomes an adjoint equivalence when restricted to functorial qcqs-schemes and essentially small qcqs-schemes. In this setting, one can show the existence of the geometric realization functor $|_$ using purely categorical methods, which further simplifies the proof. Note that the category of functors $\text{CommRing}_\ell \rightarrow \text{Set}_{\ell+1}$ and $\text{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}$ have colimits over diagrams in

$\mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$.³¹ We can define $|_$ to be the *left Kan-extension* of the restricted $\mathbf{Spec} : \mathbf{CommRing}_{\ell}^{op} \rightarrow \mathbf{LRDL}_{\ell+1}^{op}$ along the restricted \mathbf{Sp} , i.e. the Yoneda embedding. By a standard result, it is the unique functor (up to unique natural isomorphism) extending the restricted \mathbf{Spec} that is cocontinuous and left-adjoint to h .³²

In our predicative, constructive setting we do not expect to be able to show the existence of the Kan extension by general methods, as $\mathbb{Z}\text{-Fun}_{\ell}$ does not have colimits in $\mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$. Nevertheless, it is still possible to prove the comparison theorem using the explicit point-free description of $|_$ as shown in this paper. Univalence allows us to view $|_$ as a sort of adjoint inverse to h on (functorial) qcqs-schemes even with a mismatch of universe levels present. For a functorial qcqs-scheme X , $|X|$ has a cover by small affine schemes, and as sketched in Remark 5.18, we can choose a small scheme for $|X|$ in a functorial way. In other words the adjoint inverse to h is $|_$ composed with the functor choosing a small scheme for an essentially small scheme.

6 Schemes of finite presentation

For the statement and proof of the comparison theorem we required three universes $\mathbf{Type}_{\ell} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{Type}_{\ell+2}$ (the last one being the universe in which $\mathbf{LRDL}_{\ell+1}$ lives). The comparison theorem presented in the previous section is predicative in that it does not require resizing assumptions. From a truly predicative point of view, however, having to work in $\mathbf{Type}_{\ell+1}$ for a considerable part of the proof in order to prove the equivalence for schemes in \mathbf{Type}_{ℓ} feels somewhat unsatisfactorily ad hoc.³³ We thus want to outline a more “parsimonious” approach that requires only one universe, in which a specified but arbitrary ring R is assumed and an ambient universe where e.g. the category of rings (that R belongs to) lives. The caveat of this approach is that we can only describe schemes of finite presentation over R , a subclass of qcqs-schemes. However, these schemes still include many motivating examples in algebraic geometry that come from studying roots of polynomials. Blechschmidt considers the “parsimonious site” of affine schemes that are locally of finite presentation over some base scheme S , which can be constructed without size issues [Ble21, Sec. 15]. In the special case where $S = \mathbf{Spec}(R)$ is the affine scheme corresponding to our fixed ring R , one can define schemes of finite presentation over R in

³¹Showing the completeness of \mathbf{LRDL} is straightforward, perhaps even more so than the cocompleteness of locally ringed spaces. Everything, including the support, is computed point-wise.

³²See e.g. section 1.3 of [Vez10].

³³Perhaps worse still, in a certain sense the types of algebraic structures like groups and rings depend on the universe. This can be shown already in a rather minimal type theory. The special case of groups is discussed in [BCDE22].

a purely functorial way [Ble21, Sec. 16.5].³⁴ The key algebraic notion is that of a finitely presented algebra.

Definition 6.1. We say that an R -algebra A is *finitely presented* if there merely exist polynomials $p_1, \dots, p_m : R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ together with an isomorphism $A \cong R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\langle p_1, \dots, p_m \rangle$ of R -algebras. A ring morphism $\text{Hom}(R, A)$ is of *finite presentation* if it makes A into a finitely presented R -algebra. For a ring R , the category $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}$ has objects pairs of positive integers $n, m : \mathbb{N}$ together with a list of polynomials p_1, \dots, p_m with $p_i : R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Such an object $(p_1, \dots, p_m)_{n,m}$ represents the finitely presented algebra $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\langle p_1, \dots, p_m \rangle$. Accordingly, arrows are R -algebra morphisms, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} R\text{-Alg}_{fp}((p_1, \dots, p_m)_{n,m}, (q_1, \dots, q_l)_{k,m}) \\ \equiv \text{Hom}_R(R[x_1, \dots, x_n]/\langle p_1, \dots, p_m \rangle, R[x_1, \dots, x_k]/\langle q_1, \dots, q_l \rangle) \end{aligned}$$

This way, we can present the category of finitely presented R -algebras as a small category living in the same universe as R .³⁵

Example 6.2. For a ring R and $f : R$ the localization $R[1/f]$ is a finitely presented R -algebra, as $R[1/f] \cong R[x]/\langle fx-1 \rangle$.

Lemma 6.3. *If A and B are two finitely presented R -algebras, the tensor product $A \otimes_R B$ is finitely presented.*

Lemma 6.4. *Let A, B, C be rings and $\varphi : \text{Hom}(A, B)$ and $\psi : \text{Hom}(B, C)$ be morphisms of rings. Then the following hold:*

1. *If φ and ψ are of finite presentation, then $\psi \circ \varphi$ is of finite presentation.*
2. *If φ and $\psi \circ \varphi$ are of finite presentation, then ψ is of finite presentation.*

Proof. [Sta18, Tag 00F4] □

Defining schemes of finite presentation using locally ringed lattices can be done analogously to the standard classical setting. By a qcqs-scheme over R we mean a $X : \text{QcQsSch}$ together with a morphism $\pi_X : \text{LRDL}^{op}(X, \text{Spec}(R))$, and we will simply call them R -schemes. A morphism of R -schemes is a morphism in the slice category $\text{LRDL}^{op}/_{\text{Spec}(R)}$. For a R -scheme X we may regard the structure sheaf as taking values in R -algebras, i.e. $\mathcal{O}_X : L_X^{op} \rightarrow R\text{-Alg}$.

Definition 6.5. A morphism between two qcqs-schemes $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ is said to be of *finite presentation* if there are compatible affine covers u_1, \dots, u_n of L_X

³⁴These are the external counterpart for Blechschmidt’s notion of “finitely presented synthetic scheme” [Ble21, Def. 19.49].

³⁵Note that this category is not univalent. However, this does not affect any of the following results. One could of course consider the Rezk completion [Uni13, Sec. 9.8], but since we only consider functors from $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}$ to univalent categories, these will always factor through the Rezk completion.

and w_1, \dots, w_m of L_Y such that for every u_i and w_j with $u_i \leq \pi^*(w_j)$ the ring morphism $\pi^\#|_{u_i}: \mathcal{O}_Y(w_j) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(u_i)$ is of finite presentation. A qcqs-scheme X over R , is said to be of *finite presentation* if its morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Spec}(R)$ is of finite presentation.

Using Lemma 6.4 and some standard computations for morphisms of schemes, one can prove the following two lemmas.

Lemma 6.6. *A R -scheme X is of finite presentation if and only if there is an affine cover $u_1, \dots, u_n : L_X$, such that $\mathcal{O}_X(u_i)$ is a finitely presented R -algebra for all i in $1, \dots, n$.*

Lemma 6.7. *Let X and Y be two R -schemes of finite presentation, then any morphism of R -schemes $X \rightarrow Y$ is of finite presentation.*

Note that even if X is an R -scheme of finite presentation, the global sections $\mathcal{O}_X(1)$ need not be a finitely presented R -algebra.³⁶ We still get the following:

Proposition 6.8. *Let $\Gamma : \text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow R\text{-Alg}^{op}$ be the global sections functor, $\text{Spec} : R\text{-Alg}_{fp}^{op} \rightarrow \text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R)$ be the restriction of the usual spectrum functor to finitely presented algebras and $\mathcal{U} : R\text{-Alg}_{fp} \rightarrow R\text{-Alg}$ be the forgetful functor. Then we have a relative coadjunction $\Gamma \dashv_{\mathcal{U}} \text{Spec}$ whose relative counit is an isomorphism.*

Now for the functorial definition of schemes of finite presentation. These will be *finitely presented R -functors* $R\text{-Alg}_{fp} \rightarrow \text{Set}$, i.e. presheaves on $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}^{op}$. The main difference to the situation of general qcqs-schemes is that this presheaf category is locally small. Important presheaves, like \mathbb{A}^1 and \mathcal{L} are defined in the obvious way (by precomposition with the forgetful functor to rings). However, functions $X \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ and compact opens $X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ of $X : R\text{-Alg}_{fp} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ are now small types. Note that $X \Rightarrow \mathbb{A}^1$ carries an R -algebra structure but does not have to be finitely presented. Similar to the locally ringed lattice case we get a relative coadjunction with respect to the forgetful functor $\mathcal{U} : R\text{-Alg}_{fp} \rightarrow R\text{-Alg}$.

Proposition 6.9. *Let $\text{Sp} : R\text{-Alg}_{fp}^{op} \hookrightarrow \text{Fun}(R\text{-Alg}_{fp}, \text{Set})$ denote the Yoneda embedding and $\mathcal{O} : \text{Fun}(R\text{-Alg}_{fp}, \text{Set}) \rightarrow R\text{-Alg}^{op}$ the global functions functor. Then we have a relative coadjunction $\mathcal{O} \dashv_{\mathcal{U}} \text{Sp}$ whose relative counit is an isomorphism.*

The Zariski coverage on $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}^{op}$ is defined just as for CommRing^{op} . Note that this crucially relies on the fact that by Example 6.2 localizations $R[1/f]$ and by Lemma 6.3 tensor products are finitely presented. The proof of subcanonicity carries over to finitely presented algebras. Compact opens are defined just as for \mathbb{Z} -functors, leading to a functorial definition of R -schemes of finite presentation.

³⁶See e.g. [Vak00] for a concrete counterexample.

Definition 6.10. We say that $X : R\text{-Alg}_{fp} \rightarrow \text{Set}$ is a *functorial R -scheme of finite presentation* if it is local and merely has a cover $U_1, \dots, U_n : X \Rightarrow \mathcal{L}$ with $\llbracket U_i \rrbracket \cong \text{Sp}(A_i)$ for some finitely presented R -algebra A_i .³⁷

To show that the two definitions of R -schemes of finite presentation are equivalent, we proceed as for qcqs-schemes, but we do not have to be as careful about universe levels. The functor of points

$$h(_) := \text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R)(\text{Spec}(_), X) : \text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \text{Fun}(R\text{-Alg}_{fp}, \text{Set})$$

is defined just as for \mathbb{Z} -functors. The realization functor $|_$ can be defined directly following Definition 5.7 and using the fact that an object of $\text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R)$ is the same as a locally ringed lattice whose structure sheaf is a sheaf of R -algebras. Alternatively, one can take $|_$ to be the left Kan extension of Spec along Sp . Using the small definition of $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}$, this Kan extension can be shown to exist predicatively, as it can be computed pointwise [Rie17, Thm. 6.3.7].

Moreover, we get a regular adjunction $|_ \dashv h$. We can show that h sends R -schemes of finite presentation to functorial R -schemes of finite presentation, using Lemma 6.6. Similarly, $|_$ sends functorial R -schemes of finite presentation to R -schemes of finite presentation and we do not have to consider “essentially small schemes” or the like. When restricted to (functorial) R -schemes of finite presentation, the two adjoints become fully faithful, inducing an equivalence of categories as illustrated in the diagram below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
R\text{-FunSch}_{fp} & \xrightarrow{\quad \simeq \quad} & R\text{-Sch}_{fp} \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Fun}(R\text{-Alg}_{fp}, \text{Set}) & \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{h(_)} \\ \xrightarrow{\tau} \\ \xrightarrow{|_} \end{array} & \text{LRDL}^{op}/\text{Spec}(R) \\
\swarrow \text{Sp} & & \searrow \text{Spec} \\
& R\text{-Alg}_{fp}^{op} &
\end{array}$$

7 Conclusion

In this paper we gave two point-free definitions of qcqs-schemes, namely as locally ringed lattices and as \mathbb{Z} -functors, and proved the two notions equivalent. We worked constructively in HoTT/UF using univalence and higher inductive types. Due to size issues inherent in the functor of points approach, we had to work across several universes, but we did stay predicative in the sense that we did

³⁷Note that when working with a non-univalent definition of $R\text{-Alg}_{fp}$, a truncation is needed to define the property of “being an affine R -scheme of finite presentation”, i.e. the property of being a representable, see [Uni13, Thm. 9.5.9],

not require any form of propositional resizing. In the last section, we described how one can then define schemes of finite presentation over an arbitrary base ring and prove a similar equivalence result, but with less universes.

Even though univalence did play a crucial role in the proof of the main comparison theorem, many of the results in this paper should be of interest for the program of constructive algebraic geometry in general. With the constructive definition (or rather the definitions) of scheme pinned down, there are plenty of directions in which constructive algebraic geometry could be developed. We do not want to engage in speculation about which parts of this vast field can be constructivized. We want to stress, however, that because of the computational content of constructive proofs, it would be particularly interesting to see whether a constructive development can be leveraged for computational problems in algebraic geometry. The relation to synthetic algebraic geometry needs also to be explored. Especially in view of the recent use of HoTT/UF for this internal approach by Cherubini, Coquand and Hutzler [CCH23], one might hope that a comparison with our external approach can lead to fruitful insights.³⁸ Finally, it is worth noting that the fundamental notions of constructive scheme theory, as presented in this paper, allow for a concise and pleasant presentation. Hopefully, this will serve an inspiration to further the development of constructive algebraic geometry, with or without univalence.

The other main objective was of course to give an account of basic scheme theory that can be formalized in a proof assistant like `Cubical Agda`. While the paper can be used as a general blueprint for a formalization of the comparison theorem, the same cannot be said for some of the individual proofs and definitions given in the paper. Extending the formalization of functorial qcqs-schemes in [ZH24] to include all results of Section 4 should be more or less directly feasible. A formalization of qcqs-schemes as locally ringed lattices, however, should be regarded as a substantial formalization project, even with the structure sheaf of an affine scheme already formalized in [ZM23]. This is because we did not work with an exact definition of the structure sheaf and instead relied heavily on canonical isomorphisms. The case that this common practice generally creates an obstacle towards formalization was put forward rather convincingly by Buzzard [Buz24]. In view of the results of [ZM23], one might hope that in this particular instance univalence could be of help, but as indicated in the paper, careful and clever rephrasing of many of the results and constructions might be required. Ultimately, it appears necessary to prove a lot of results on locally ringed lattices in terms of sheaves obtained by Kan extensions, before even being able to describe affine schemes as locally ringed lattices. Formalizing the proof of the univalent constructive comparison theorem will certainly hold many surprises. All in all, such a formalization would figure as a major milestone in formal univalent set-level mathematics.

³⁸For an overview of the many (sub-) topics currently investigated in this fascinating young research program see <https://github.com/felixwellen/synthetic-zariski>

References

- [ACMZ21] Carlo Angiuli, Evan Cavallo, Anders Mörtberg, and Max Zeuner. Internalizing representation independence with univalence. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 5(POPL), January 2021. doi:10.1145/3434293.
- [AL19] Benedikt Ahrens and Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine. Displayed Categories. *Logical Methods in Computer Science*, Volume 15, Issue 1, March 2019. URL: <https://lmcs.episciences.org/5252>, doi:10.23638/LMCS-15(1:20)2019.
- [AM69] Michael Francis Atiyah and Ian Grant MacDonald. *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*. Addison-Wesley-Longman, 1969.
- [BCDE22] Marc Bezem, Thierry Coquand, Peter Dybjer, and Martín Escardó. The Burali-Forti argument in HoTT/UF with applications to the type of groups in a universe. Agda formalization available at <https://www.cs.bham.ac.uk/~mhe/TypeTopology/Ordinals.BuraliForti.html>, 2022.
- [Ble21] Ingo Blechschmidt. Using the internal language of toposes in algebraic geometry, 2021. arXiv:2111.03685.
- [Buz24] Kevin Buzzard. Grothendieck’s use of equality, 2024. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2405.10387>, arXiv:2405.10387.
- [CCH23] Felix Cherubini, Thierry Coquand, and Matthias Hutzler. A foundation for synthetic algebraic geometry, 2023. arXiv:2307.00073.
- [CD13] Thierry Coquand and Nils Anders Danielsson. Isomorphism is equality. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 24(4):1105–1120, 2013. In memory of N.G. (Dick) de Bruijn (1918–2012). URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019357713000694>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indag.2013.09.002>.
- [CL03] Thierry Coquand and Henri Lombardi. Hidden constructions in abstract algebra: Krull dimension of distributive lattices and commutative rings. In *Commutative ring theory and applications*, volume 231 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Applied Mathematics*, pages 477–499. Dekker, New-York, 2003. doi:10.1201/9780203910627.
- [CLS07] Thierry Coquand, Henri Lombardi, and Peter Schuster. The projective spectrum as a distributive lattice. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie différentielle catégoriques*, 48(3):220–228, 2007. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item/CTGDC_2007__48_3_220_0/.

- [CLS09] Thierry Coquand, Henri Lombardi, and Peter Schuster. Spectral schemes as ringed lattices. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 56(3):339–360, 2009. doi:10.1007/s10472-009-9160-7.
- [DG71] Jean Dieudonné and Alexandre Grothendieck. *Éléments de géométrie algébrique*, volume 166. Springer Berlin Heidelberg New York, 1971.
- [DG80] Michel Demazure and Peter Gabriel. *Introduction to algebraic geometry and algebraic groups*. Elsevier, 1980.
- [EH06] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. *The geometry of schemes*, volume 197. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [En83] Luis Español. Le spectre d’un anneau dans l’algèbre constructive et applications à la dimension. *Cahiers de Topologie et Géométrie Différentielle Catégoriques*, 24(2):133–144, 1983. URL: http://www.numdam.org/item/CTGDC_1983__24_2_133_0/.
- [Esc22] Martín Hötzel Escardó. Introduction to Univalent Foundations of Mathematics with Agda, 2022. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.00580>, arXiv:1911.00580.
- [GG74] Alexandre Grothendieck and Federico Gaeta. *Introduction to Functorial Algebraic Geometry: After a Summer Course*. State University of New York at Buffalo, Department of Mathematics, 1974. <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/files/GrothendieckIntrodFunctorialGeometryI1973.pdf>.
- [Hak72] Monique Hakim. *Topos annelés et schémas relatifs*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1972.
- [Har13] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*, volume 52. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [Jan87] Jens Carsten Jantzen. *Representations of algebraic groups*. Academic Press, Boston, 1987. earlier preprint available at https://archive.mpim-bonn.mpg.de/id/eprint/607/1/preprint_1985_9.pdf.
- [Joh82] Peter T. Johnstone. *Stone spaces*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 1982.
- [Joh02] Peter T Johnstone. *Sketches of an Elephant: A Topos Theory Compendium: Volume 2*, volume 2. Oxford University Press, 2002.
- [Joy76] André Joyal. Les théoremes de chevalley-tarski et remarques sur l’algèbre constructive. *Cahiers Topologie Géom. Différentielle*, 16:256–258, 1976.
- [Koc76] Anders Kock. Universal projective geometry via topos theory. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 9:1–24, 1976. doi:10.1016/0022-4049(76)90002-5.

- [Mad13] David Madore. Comment définir efficacement ce qu'est un schéma. David Madore's WebLog, 2013. <http://www.madore.org/~david/weblog/d.2013-09-21.2160.definition-schema.html>.
- [ML75] Per Martin-Löf. An Intuitionistic Theory of Types: Predicative Part. In H. E. Rose and J. C. Shepherdson, editors, *Logic Colloquium '73*, volume 80 of *Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics*, pages 73–118. North-Holland, 1975. doi:10.1016/S0049-237X(08)71945-1.
- [ML13] Saunders Mac Lane. *Categories for the working mathematician*, volume 5. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [MLM12] Saunders Mac Lane and Ieke Moerdijk. *Sheaves in geometry and logic: A first introduction to topos theory*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [Mum99] David Mumford. *The red book of varieties and schemes: includes the Michigan lectures (1974) on curves and their Jacobians*, volume 1358. Springer Science & Business Media, 1999.
- [nLa24a] nLab authors. coverage. <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/coverage>, May 2024. Revision 42.
- [nLa24b] nLab authors. relative adjoint functor. <https://ncatlab.org/nlab/show/relative+adjoint+functor>, May 2024. Revision 17.
- [NW08] Marc Nieper-Wißkirchen. Algebraische geometrie. unpublished lecture notes, 2008.
- [Rie17] Emily Riehl. *Category Theory in Context*. Courier Dover Publications, 2017.
- [Sch03] Peter Michael Schuster. Spectra and sheaves in formal topology, 2003. Habilitationsschrift, Universität München.
- [Sch06] Peter Schuster. Formal zariski topology: Positivity and points. *Annals of Pure and Applied Logic*, 137(1):317–359, 2006. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016800720500076X>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apal.2005.05.026>.
- [Sch08] Peter Schuster. The zariski spectrum as a formal geometry. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 405(1):101–115, 2008. Computational Structures for Modelling Space, Time and Causality. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397508004507>, doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2008.06.030>.

- [Sta18] The Stacks Project Authors. *Stacks Project*. <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu>, 2018.
- [Sto38] Marshall Harvey Stone. Topological representations of distributive lattices and brouwerian logics. *Časopis pro pěstování matematiky a fysiky*, 67(1):1–25, 1938.
- [Uni13] The Univalent Foundations Program. *Homotopy Type Theory: Univalent Foundations of Mathematics*. <https://homotopytypetheory.org/book>, Institute for Advanced Study, 2013.
- [Vak00] Ravi Vakil. An example of a nice variety whose ring of global sections is not finitely generated. Unpublished note available online at <https://math.stanford.edu/~vakil/files/nonfg.pdf>, 2000.
- [Vak24] Ravi Vakil. *The Rising Sea: Foundations of Algebraic Geometry*. Preprint, 2024. URL: <http://math.stanford.edu/~vakil/216blog/FOAGfeb2124public.pdf>.
- [vBB21] Johannes Schipp von Branitz and Ulrik Buchholtz. Using Displayed Univalent Graphs to Formalize Higher Groups in Univalent Foundations. unpublished draft available online at <https://ulrikbuchholtz.dk/durges.pdf>, 2021.
- [Vez10] Alberto Vezzani. On the geometry over the field with one element. Master’s thesis, Università degli Studi di Milano, 2010. Available at https://www.math.univ-paris13.fr/~vezzani/Files/Research/tesi_vezzani.pdf.
- [Voe11] Vladimir Voevodsky. Resizing rules – their use and semantic justification. slides from a talk at types, bergen, 11 september, 2011. URL: https://www.math.ias.edu/vladimir/sites/math.ias.edu.vladimir/files/2011_Bergen.pdf.
- [Voe15] Vladimir Voevodsky. An experimental library of formalized mathematics based on the univalent foundations. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 25(5):1278–1294, 2015. doi:10.1017/S0960129514000577.
- [ZH24] Max Zeuner and Matthias Hutzler. The Functor of Points Approach to Schemes in Cubical Agda. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.13088>, 2024. arXiv:2403.13088.
- [ZM23] Max Zeuner and Anders Mörtberg. A Univalent Formalization of Constructive Affine Schemes. In Delia Kesner and Pierre-Marie Pédrot, editors, *28th International Conference on Types for Proofs and Programs (TYPES 2022)*, volume 269 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 14:1–14:24, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.

URL: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/opus/volltexte/2023/18457>,
doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.TYPES.2022.14.