

Tangent-Obstruction Theories and Smoothness

Jeremy Nohel

University of Wisconsin

10 July 2025

Motivation: Infinitesimal Lifting

Theorem (Infinitesimal Lifting Property)

Let $\text{Spec}(A)$ be smooth of finite type over k ,
 $f : \text{Spec}(B) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ be a morphism of k -schemes, and Y' be a scheme such that $\text{Spec}(B)$ is a closed subscheme defined by a nilpotent ideal sheaf. Then there exists a morphism $f' : Y' \rightarrow \text{Spec}(A)$ such that $f'|_{\text{Spec}(B)} = f$.

Remarks

1. Exercise: Y' above is actually affine.
2. To rephrase: If $\text{Spec}(A)$ is a smooth affine scheme and $B' \twoheadrightarrow B$ is a “nilpotent thickening” as above, then the natural map $\text{Hom}(A, B') \rightarrow \text{Hom}(A, B)$ is surjective. All that follows explores this interpretation.

Proof of Infinitesimal Lifting: Preliminaries

Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & B \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \nwarrow \text{---} \text{dashed} & & \uparrow f \\ & & & & \exists? & & A \end{array}$$

Lemma (Exercise). If any lift θ of f exists, and $\delta : A \rightarrow I$ is a k -derivation, then $\theta + \delta$ is another such lift. Conversely, if $\theta_{1,2}$ are two lifts, then $\theta_1 - \theta_2$ is a k -derivation.

Thus the set of possible lifts is either empty or has a simply transitive action by $\text{Hom}_A(\Omega_{A/k}, I)$ (independent of smoothness).

Claim (Exercise). It is enough to show the theorem in the case $I^2 = 0$.

Proof of Infinitesimal Lifting: Main Construction

Now there exists a polynomial ring P with a surjection $P \twoheadrightarrow A$ and a map $h : P \rightarrow B'$. These fit into a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & I & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \uparrow h & & \uparrow f & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & J & \longrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Thus $h|_J$ sends J to I ; as $I^2 = 0$, $h|_J$ factors through J/J^2 . Call this map (of P -modules) \bar{h} . Both of these also have a compatible A -module structure.

Proof of Infinitesimal Lifting: Smoothness

Now: J/J^2 is the *conormal sheaf* of $\text{Spec}(A)$ in $\text{Spec}(P)$.

As A is smooth, we have an exact sequence of A -modules (in general, it is only right-exact):

$$0 \longrightarrow J/J^2 \longrightarrow \Omega_{P/k} \otimes_P A \longrightarrow \Omega_{A/k} \longrightarrow 0$$

Taking the associated long exact sequence to $\text{Hom}_A(-, I)$, we see that $\text{Hom}(\Omega_{P/k} \otimes A, I) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(J/J^2, I)$ is surjective if

$\text{Ext}^1(\Omega_{A/k}, I) = 0$. But this is the case because A is smooth, so every map $g : J/J^2 \rightarrow I$ lifts to $\text{Hom}(\Omega_{P/k} \otimes A, I)$. As the A and P -module structures on I agree,
 $\text{Hom}(\Omega_{P/k} \otimes A, I) = \text{Hom}_P(\Omega_{P/k}, I)$.

Proof of Infinitesimal Lifting: Conclusion and Remarks

In particular, $\bar{h} : J/J^2 \rightarrow I$ lifts to a k -derivation $\theta : P \rightarrow I$. Recall \bar{h} came from a ring homomorphism $h : P \rightarrow B'$. The conclusion follows from

Claim (Exercise). $h - \theta : P \rightarrow B$ is a ring homomorphism that descends to A and lifts f .

Remarks.

1. We see the action of $\text{Hom}_A(\Omega_{A/k}, I)$ in the choice of lift for \bar{h} . By the first lemma, the resulting lifts are independent of P .
2. We want to extend this to deformation functors: how does a deformation functor behave under nilpotent thickenings? This is partially answered by *tangent-obstruction theories*: the “obstruction” detects when a lift is possible and the “tangent” parametrizes lifts. The idea is that a functor “is” smooth when lifting is possible, i.e. the obstruction vanishes.

Tangent-Obstruction Theories

Let $D : \mathbf{Art}_k^{loc} \rightarrow \mathbf{Set}$ be a deformation functor.

A *small extension* in \mathbf{Art}_k^{loc} is a surjection $p : B \rightarrow A$ with $\ker(p) := M$ one-dimensional over k .

Definition

A *tangent-obstruction theory* for D is a pair (T^1, T^2) of f.d. k -vector spaces satisfying:

- For any small extension, there is a functorial exact sequence

$$T^1 \otimes M \longrightarrow D(B) \longrightarrow D(A) \xrightarrow{ob} T^2 \otimes M$$

- $ob(a) = 0$ iff a lifts to $D(B)$.
- If a lifts, there is a transitive action of $T^1 \otimes M$ on the set of lifts.
- If $A = k$, the action is simply transitive.

Example 1: Complete Local k -algebra

Proposition.

Let S be a complete Noetherian local k -algebra such that $\dim_k(\mathfrak{m}_S/\mathfrak{m}_S^2) = d$ and let $p : k[[x_1, \dots, x_d]] \rightarrow S$ be a surjection (exercise: this always exists) with kernel J . Let $T^1 := \operatorname{Hom}_S(\mathfrak{m}_S/\mathfrak{m}_S^2, k)$, $T^2 := \operatorname{Hom}_S(J/\mathfrak{m}_S J, k)$. Then (T^1, T^2) is a tangent-obstruction theory for $h_S := \operatorname{Hom}(S, -)$.

Proof in the notes (discussion after Definition 2.7).

Remarks.

1. Recall that any such an S is smooth iff it is isomorphic to $k[[x_1, \dots, x_d]]$ – exactly when T^2 vanishes. Hence “obstruction”.
2. Notice that T^1 is the tangent space of S . This is not a coincidence; it follows from considering $A = k$ (i.e., $T^1 = D(k[\epsilon]/(\epsilon^2))$). Hence “tangent”.

Example 2: Smooth Proper Schemes

Proposition.

Let X be a smooth proper scheme. Let D be the functor that sends $A \in \text{Art}_k^{\text{loc}}$ to the set of X_A , flat over A , with fixed isomorphism $\varphi_A : X_A \times_A k \simeq X$. Then $T^i := H^i(X, T_X)$ is a tangent-obstruction theory for D .

We first study the deformations of affine schemes X (i.e. instead of smooth proper X , consider smooth affine X). The idea is to patch these together to deduce the general case.

Lemma.

Let D be as above with X affine. Then $X' \in D(A)$ is the *trivial deformation* $X \times \text{Spec}(A)$.

Example 2: Smooth Proper Schemes. Proof of Lemma

By the infinitesimal lifting property, the isomorphism $\varphi : Y' \times_A k \simeq Y$ lifts to a morphism $\varphi' : Y' \rightarrow Y$. Note that inverting φ and composing with the projection $Y' \times A \rightarrow Y'$ gives a morphism $i : Y \rightarrow Y'$ such that $\varphi' \circ i = id$. Translating to ring theory terms, φ' gives a splitting for the extension $R' \twoheadrightarrow R$.

Example 2: Smooth Proper Schemes, T^1

We now identify T^1 and T^2 for D . Cover X (smooth, proper) by affines U_i . We are interested in schemes X' over $k(\epsilon)/(\epsilon^2)$ together with a fixed isomorphism $\varphi : X' \times_{k(\epsilon)/(\epsilon^2)} k \simeq X$. We want to glue from affines U'_i over $k(\epsilon)/(\epsilon^2)$. By the lemma, we have $f_i : U'_i \simeq U_i \times k(\epsilon)/(\epsilon^2)$, where we can change trivialization by $\text{Aut}_{U_i}(U'_i) = \Gamma(U_i, U_i \times (\epsilon)) = H^0(U_i, T_{U_i})$. On overlaps we have transition functions g_{ij} . They are compatible exactly when they satisfy a cocycle condition. If they do, this defines a Čech 1-cocycle. Hence, $T^1 = H^1(X, T_X)$.

Example 2: Smooth Proper Schemes, T^2

We see that no global lift exists if the g_{ij} do not satisfy a cocycle condition; it can be off by a 2-cocycle. Thus $H^2(X, T_X)$ is a candidate for T^2 . Observe that the above argument goes through over any base $A \in \text{Art}_k^{\text{loc}}$ with $B \rightarrow A$ a small extension with the difference that $\text{Aut}_{U_i}(U'_i) = H^0(U_i, U_i \times M)$. Globalizing and applying the projection formula (the $M \times U_i$ glue to a vector bundle over X) identifies the obstruction class as lying in $H^2(X, T_X) \otimes M$ (details are in the notes, Theorem 3.4).

Example 3: Coherent Sheaves (Vector Bundles)

Proposition.

Let X be a smooth proper scheme and \mathcal{E} be a coherent sheaf (vector bundle) on X . Let D be the functor that sends $A \in \mathbf{Art}_k^{loc}$ to the set of coherent sheaves (vector bundles) \mathcal{E}_A on $X \times A$, flat over A , with a fixed isomorphism $\varphi_A : \mathcal{E}_A \otimes_A k \simeq \mathcal{E}$. Then $T^i := \mathrm{Ext}^i(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$, $i = 1, 2$ is a tangent-obstruction theory for D .

Dima proved this last time for vector bundles. The argument is similarly by patching trivial deformations. Dima also proved that $\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ was the tangent space of D .

In general, $\mathrm{Ext}^2(\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{E})$ being the obstruction space relies on deeper homological techniques because we can't appeal to local triviality.

Application to Moduli Spaces

Corollary.

Let C be a smooth projective curve of genus g . The moduli space of smooth curves of genus g , \mathcal{M}_g ($g \geq 2$), is smooth at $[C]$. The tangent space to \mathcal{M}_g at a curve $[C]$ is identified with $H^1(C, T_C) = H^0(C, (\Omega_C^1)^{\otimes 2})^*$ (Serre duality), which has dimension $(4g - 4) + 1 - g = 3g - 3$ (Riemann-Roch).

Corollary.

Let X be a smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 2$. For a stable rank- n vector bundle \mathcal{E} , the moduli space of stable rank- n vector bundles on X is smooth at $[\mathcal{E}]$ and has tangent space $H^1(X, \mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{E})) = H^0(X, \mathcal{E}nd(\mathcal{E}) \otimes K_X)^*$ at \mathcal{E} , which has dimension $n^2(g - 1) + 1$ (Riemann-Roch for vector bundles).

Pro-representability, Formal Smoothness, and Hulls

Definition.

A morphism of deformation functors $\alpha : F \rightarrow G$ is (formally) *smooth* if for $B \rightarrow A$ a small extension we have $F(B) \rightarrow F(A) \times_{G(A)} G(B)$ is surjective.

Definition.

A deformation functor D is *pro-representable* if there exists a complete Noetherian local k -algebra R and an isomorphism $D \simeq \text{Hom}(R, -)$.

Definition.

A *hull* for D is a complete Noetherian local k -algebra R and a smooth morphism $\alpha : \text{Hom}(R, -) \rightarrow D$ which is bijective on $k(\epsilon)/(\epsilon)^2$.

Theorem.

A hull exists for D iff D has a tangent-obstruction theory $T_D^{1,2}$, and furthermore, D is pro-representable iff

$$0 \rightarrow T_D^1 \otimes M \rightarrow D(B) \rightarrow D(A) \rightarrow T_D^2 \otimes M$$

is left-exact for all small extensions $B \rightarrow A$.

Proof (sketch). For the second part, we need to show that the surjection $h_S(B) \rightarrow h_S(A) \times_{D(A)} D(B)$ is a bijection. But if the tangent-obstruction sequence is left-exact, $T_D^1 \otimes M$ acts simply transitively on lifts from $D(A)$ and this is identified with $T_S^1 \otimes M$ (the bijection on tangent spaces guarantees this). This in turn implies the second part.

Proof of Baby Schlessinger

$h_S := \operatorname{Hom}(S, -)$ has $T_S^1 = (\mathfrak{m}_S/\mathfrak{m}_S^2)^*$, $T_S^2 = (J/\mathfrak{m}_S J)^*$ a tangent-obstruction theory. Pick S smooth with $T_S^1 \simeq T_D^1$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T_S^1 \otimes M & \longrightarrow & h_S(B) & \longrightarrow & h_S(A) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & T_D^1 \otimes M & \longrightarrow & D(B) & \longrightarrow & D(A) \longrightarrow T_D^2 \otimes M \end{array}$$

$T_S^1 \otimes M$ acts transitively on lifts from $D(A)$ in $D(B)$ while it acts *simply transitively* on lifts from $h_S(A)$ in $h_S(B)$. This defines a surjection $h_S(B) \rightarrow D(B) \times_{D(A)} h_S(A)$. Taking $A = k$ and composing small extensions defines surjections $h_S(B) \rightarrow D(B)$ for all B , hence a morphism. Since we have this for all small extensions, such an S defines a hull for D .

Looking Ahead

- We will first be interested in representability and smoothness properties of deformation functors. The first major result is Schlessinger's criteria for pro-representability/hulls (which is closely related to the “Baby Schlessinger” result above).
- If we have some pro-representability result, we are interested in extending it to something global. There is a nice example of this in the notes with an application to Picard groups (Theorem 2.14). Artin's paper “Algebraization of Formal Moduli I” provides some very general theory.

Thank you!