Banach rings

Contents

1. Introduction 4
2. Semi-normed Abelian groups 4
3. Semi-normed rings 5
4. Banach rings 6
5. Semi-normed modules 9
6. Berkovich spectra 12
7. Bornology 13

Bibliography 15

1. Introduction

This section conerns the theory of Banach algebras. Our references are [Ber12] and [BGR84].

In this chapter, all rings are assumed to be commutative.

2. Semi-normed Abelian groups

Definition 2.1. Let A be an Abelian group. A *semi-norm* on A is a function $\|\bullet\| : A \to [0,\infty]$ satisfying

(1) $\|0\| = 0$;
(2) $\|f - g\| \leq \|f\| + \|g\|$ for all $f, g \in A$.

A semi-norm $\|\bullet\|$ on A is a *norm* if moreover the following conditions is satisfied:

(0) if $\|f\| = 0$ for some $f \in A$, then $f = 0$.

We write

$$\ker \|\bullet\| = \{a \in A : \|a\| = 0\}.$$

A semi-norm $\|\bullet\|$ on A is *non-Archimedean* or *ultra-metric* if Condition (2) can be replaced by

(2') $\|f - g\| \leq \max\{\|f\|, \|g\|\}$ for all $f, g \in A$.

Definition 2.2. A *semi-normed Abelian group* (resp. *normed Abelian group*) is a pair $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ consisting of an Abelian group A and a semi-norm (resp. norm) $\|\bullet\|$ on A. When $\|\bullet\|$ is clear from the context, we also say A is a semi-normed Abelian group (resp. normed Abelian group).

Definition 2.3. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|_A)$ be a semi-normed Abelian group and $B \subseteq A$ be a subgroup. Then we define the *quotient semi-norm* $\|\bullet\|_{A/B}$ on A/B as follows:

$$\|a + B\|_{A/B} := \inf\{\|a + b\|_A : b \in B\}$$

for all $a + B \in A/B$.

We define the *subgroup semi-norm* on B as follows:

$$\|b\|_B = \|b\|_A$$

for all $b \in B$.

Definition 2.4. Let A be an Abelian group and $\|\bullet\|$, $\|\bullet\|'$ be two seminorms on A. We say $\|\bullet\|$ and $\|\bullet\|'$ are *equivalent* if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$C^{-1}\|f\| \leq \|f\|' \leq C\|f\|$$

for all $f \in A$.

Definition 2.5. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|_A)$, $(B, \|\bullet\|_B)$ be semi-normed Abelian groups. A homomorphism $\varphi : A \to B$ is said to be

(1) *bounded* if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|\varphi(f)\|_B \leq C\|f\|_A$ for any $f \in A$;
(2) *admissible* if the quotient semi-norm on $A/\ker\varphi$ is equivalent to the subspace semi-norm on $\operatorname{Im}\varphi$.

Observe that an admissible homomorphism is always bounded.

Next we study the topology defined by a semi-norm.

Lemma 2.6. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a semi-normed Abelian group. Define

$$d(a,b) = \|a-b\|$$

for $a, b \in A$. Then $\|\bullet\|$ is a pseudo-metric on A. This psuedo-metric is a metric if and only if $\|\bullet\|$ is a norm.

Let $\hat{A}$ be the metric completion of A, then there is a norm $\|\bullet\|$ on $\hat{A}$ inducing its metric. Moreover, the natural homomorphism $A \to \hat{A}$ is an isometric homomorphism with dense image.

Proof. This is clear from the definitions. □

We always endow A with the topology induced by the psuedo-metric d.

Definition 2.7. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a semi-normed Abelian group. The normed Abelian group $(\hat{A}, \|\bullet\|)$ constructed in Lemma 2.6 is called the *completion* of $(A, \|\bullet\|)$.

3. Semi-normed rings

Definition 3.1. Let A be a ring. A *semi-norm* $\|\bullet\|$ on A is a semi-norm $\|\bullet\|$ on the underlying additive group satisfying the following extra properties:

(3) $\|1\| = 1$;
(4) for any $f, g \in A$, $\|fg\| \leq \|f\| \cdot \|g\|$.

A semi-norm $\|\bullet\|$ on A is called *power-multiplicative* if $\|f\|^n = \|f^n\|$ for all $f \in A$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

A semi-norm $\|\bullet\|$ on A is called *multiplicative* if $\|fg\| = \|f\|\|g\|$ for all $f, g \in A$.

Definition 3.2. A *semi-normed ring* (resp. *normed ring*) is a pair $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ consisting of a ring A and a semi-norm (resp. norm) $\|\bullet\|$ on A. When $\|\bullet\|$ is clear from the context, we also say A is a semi-normed ring (resp. normed ring).

Definition 3.3. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a semi-normed ring. An element $a \in A$ is *multiplicative* if $a \notin \ker \|\bullet\|$ and for any $x \in A$,

$$\|ax\| = \|a\| \cdot \|x\|.$$

Definition 3.4. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a normed ring. An element $a \in A$ is *power-bounded* if $\{|a^n| : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{R}$. The set of power-bounded elements in A is denoted by $\mathring{A}$.

An element $a \in A$ is called *topologically nilpotent* if $a^n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. The set of topologically nilpotent elements in A is denoted by $\check{A}$.

Observe that $\check{A}$ is an ideal in $\mathring{A}$. We write $\tilde{A} = \mathring{A}/\check{A}$.

Definition 3.5. Let A be a ring. A *semi-valuation* on A is a multiplicative semi-norm on A. A semi-valuation on A is a *valuation* on A if its underlying semi-norm of Abelian groups is a norm.

Definition 3.6. A *semi-valued ring* (resp. *valued ring*) is a pair $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ consisting of a ring A and a semi-valuation (resp. valuation) $\|\bullet\|$ on A. When $\|\bullet\|$ is clear from the context, we also say A is a semi-valued ring (resp. valued ring).

A semi-valued ring (resp. valued ring) $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ is called a *semi-valued field* (resp. *valued field*) if A is a field.

4. Banach rings

Definition 4.1. A *Banach ring* is a normed ring that is complete with respect to the metric defined in Lemma 2.6.

Definition 4.2. Let A be a semi-normed ring. There is an obvious ring structure on the completion $\hat{A}$ of A defined in Definition 2.7. We call the resulting Banach ring the *completion* of A.

Proposition 4.3. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a Banach ring and $f \in A$. Assume that $\|f\| < 1$, then $1 - f$ is invertible.

Proof. Define

$$g = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f^i.$$

From our assumption, the series converges and $g \in A$. It is elementary to check that g is the inverse of $1 - f$. □

Corollary 4.4. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a Banach ring. Then the set of invertible elements in A is open.

Proof. Let $x \in A$ be an invertible element. It suffices to show that for any $y \in A$, $|y| < 1/(\|x^{-1}\|)$, $y + x$ is invertible. For this purpose, it suffices to show that $1 + x^{-1}y$ is invertible. But this follows from Proposition 4.3. □

Corollary 4.5. Let A be a Banach ring and $\mathfrak{m}$ be a maximal ideal in A. Then $\mathfrak{m}$ is closed.

Proof. The closure $\bar{\mathfrak{m}}$ is obviously an ideal in A. We need to show that $\mathfrak{m} \neq A$. Namely, 1 is not in the closure of $\mathfrak{m}$. But clearly, $\mathfrak{m}$ is contained in the set of non-invertible elements, the latter being closed by Corollary 4.4. So we conclude. □

Definition 4.6. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a Banach ring. We define the *spectral radius* $\rho = \rho_A : A \to [0, \infty)$ as follows:

$$\rho(f) = \inf_{n \geq 1} \|f^n\|^{1/n}, \quad f \in A.$$

Lemma 4.7. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a Banach ring. Then for any $f \in A$, we have

$$\rho(f) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \|f^n\|^{1/n}.$$

Proof. This follows from the multiplicative version of Fekete's lemma. □

Example 4.8. The ring $\mathbb{C}$ with its usual norm $|\bullet|$ is a Banach ring. In fact, $(\mathbb{C}, |\bullet|)$ is a complete valued field.

Example 4.9. For any Banach ring $(A, \|\bullet\|)$, any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $r = (r_1, \dots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$, we define $A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle = A\langle r_1^{-1}z_1, \dots, r_n^{-1}z_n\rangle$ as the subring of $A[[z_1, \dots, z_n]]$ consisting of formal power series

$$f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_\alpha z^\alpha, \quad a_\alpha \in A$$

such that

$$\|f\|_r := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|a_\alpha\| r^\alpha < \infty.$$

We will verify in Proposition 4.10 that $(A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle, \|\bullet\|_r)$ is a Banach ring.

When $r = (1, \dots, 1)$, we omit r^{-1} from our notations.

Proposition 4.10. In the setting of Example 4.9, $(A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle, \|\bullet\|_r)$ is a Banach ring.

Proof. By induction, we may assume that $n = 1$.

It is obvious that $\|\bullet\|_r$ is a norm on the undelrying Abelian group. To see that $\|\bullet\|_r$ is a norm on the ring $A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle$, we need to verify the condition in Definition 3.1. Condition (3) in Definition 3.1 is obvious. Let us consider Condition (4). Let

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i z^i, \quad g = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_j z^j$$

be two elements in $A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle$. Then

$$fg = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j \right) z^k.$$

We compute

$$\|fg\|_r = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left\| \sum_{i+j=k} a_i b_j \right\| r^k \leq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i+j=k} \|a_i\| \cdot \|b_j\| \right) r^k = \|f\|_r \cdot \|g\|_r.$$

It remains to verify that $A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle$ is complete.

For this purpose, take a Cauchy sequence

$$f^b = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^b z^i \in A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle$$

for $b \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for each i, the coefficients $(a_i^b)_b$ is a Cauchy sequence in A. Let a_i be the limit of a_i^b as $b \to \infty$ and set

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i z^i \in A[[z]].$$

We need to show that $f \in A\langle r^{-1}z\rangle$ and $f^b \to f$.

Fix a constant $\epsilon > 0$. There is $m = m(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $j \geq m$ and all $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|a_i^{j+k} - a_i^j\| r^i < \epsilon/2.$$

In particular, for any $s > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i - a_i^j\| r^i \leq \sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i - a_i^{j+k}\| r^i + \sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i^j - a_i^{j+k}\| r^i \leq \sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i - a_i^{j+k}\| r^i + \epsilon/2.$$

When k is large enough, we can guarantee that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i - a_i^{j+k}\| r^i < \epsilon/2.$$

So

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} \|a_i - a_i^j\| r^i \leq \epsilon.$$

Let $s \to \infty$, we find

$$\|f - f^j\|_r \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|a_i - a_i^j\| r^i \leq \epsilon.$$

In particular, $\|f\|_r < \infty$ and $f^j \to f$ as $j \to \infty$. $\square$

Example 4.11. For any non-Archimedean Banach ring $(A, \|\bullet\|)$, any $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n_{>0}$, we define $A\{r^{-1}T\} = A\{r_1^{-1}T_1, \ldots, r_n^{-1}T_n\}$ as the subring of $A[[T_1, \ldots, T_n]]$ consisting of formal power series

$$f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} a_\alpha T^\alpha, \quad a_\alpha \in A$$

such that $\|a_\alpha\| r^\alpha \to 0$ as $|\alpha| \to \infty$. We set

$$\|f\|_r := \max_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n} \|a_\alpha\| r^\alpha.$$

We will verify in Proposition 4.12 that $(A\langle r^{-1}T\rangle, \|\bullet\|_r)$ is a Banach ring.

The semi-norm $\|\bullet\|_r$ is called the *Gauss norm*.

Proposition 4.12. In the setting of Example 4.11, $(A\{r^{-1}T\}, \|\bullet\|_r)$ is a Banach ring.

Moreover, if the norm $\|\bullet\|$ on A is a valuation, so is $\|\bullet\|_r$.

The second part is usually known as the *Gauss lemma*.

Proof. By induction on n, we may assume that $n = 1$.

The proof of the fact that $\|\bullet\|_r$ is a norm is similar to that of Proposition 4.10. We leave the details to the readers.

Next we argue that $(A\{r^{-1}T\}, \|\bullet\|_r)$ is complete. Take a Cauchy sequence

$$f^b = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i^b T^i \in A\{r^{-1}T\}$$

for $b \in \mathbb{N}$. As

$$\|a_i^b - a_i^{b'}\| r^i \leq \|f^b - f^{b'}\|_r$$

for any $i, b, b' \geq 0$, it follows that for any $i \geq 0$, $\{a_i^b\}_b$ is a Cauchy sequence. Let $a_i \in A$ be its limit and set

$$f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i T^i \in A[[T]].$$

We need to show that $f \in A\{r^{-1}T\}$ and $f^b \to f$.

Fix $\epsilon > 0$. We can find $m = m(\epsilon) > 0$ such that for all $j \geq m$ and all $k \geq 0$,

$$\|f^j - f^{j+k}\|_r \leq \epsilon.$$

It follows that $\|a_i^j - a_i^{j+k}\| r^i \leq \epsilon$ for all $i \geq 0$. Let $k \to \infty$, we find

$$\|a_i^j - a_i\| r^i \leq \epsilon$$

for all $i \geq 0$. Fix $j \geq 0$, take i large enough so that $|a_i^j| r^i < \epsilon$. Then $\|a_i\| r^i \leq \epsilon$. So we find $f \in A\{r^{-1}T\}$. On the other hand,

$$\|f - f^j\|_r = \max_i \|a_i^j - a_i\| r^i \leq \epsilon.$$

This proves that $f^j \to f$.

Now assume that $\|\bullet\|$ is a valuation, we verify that $\|\bullet\|_r$ is also a valuation. Again, we may assume that $n=1$. Take two elements $f,g\in A\{r^{-1}T\}$:

$$f=\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}a_iT^i,\quad g=\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}b_jT^j.$$

As we have already shown $|fg|_r\leq |f|_r|g|_r$, it suffices to check the reverse inequality. For this purpose, choose the minimal indices i, j so that

$$\|f\|_r=\|a_i\|r^i,\quad \|g\|_r=\|b_j\|r^j.$$

Write

$$fg=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{p+q=k}a_pb_q\right)T^k.$$

Then we claim that

$$\left\|\sum_{p+q=k}a_pb_q\right\|r^k=\|f\|_r\|g\|_r$$

when $k=i+j$. This implies the desired inequality. Of course, we may assume that $a_i\neq 0$ and $b_j\neq 0$ as otherwise there is nothing to prove. To verify our claim, it suffices to observe that for $(p,q)\neq(i,j)$, $r+s=i+j$, say $p<i$ and $q>j$, we have

$$\|a_pb_q\|r^k=\|a_p\|r^p\cdot\|b_q\|r^q<\|a_i\|r^i\cdot\|b_j\|r^j.$$

So

$$\|a_pb_q\|<\|a_ib_j\|.$$

Since the valuation on A is non-Archimedean, it follows that

$$\|\sum_{p+q=k}a_pb_q\|=\|a_ib_j\|.$$

Our claim follows. □

5. Semi-normed modules

Definition 5.1. Let $(A,\|\bullet\|_A)$ be a normed ring. A *semi-normed A-module* (resp. *normed A-module*) is a pair $(M,\|\bullet\|_M)$ consisting of a A-module M and a semi-norm (resp. norm) on the underlying Abelian group of M such that there is a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\|fm\|_M\leq C\|f\|_A\|m\|_M$$

for all $f\in A$ and $m\in M$. When $\|\bullet\|_M$ is clear from the context, we say M is a semi-normed A-module (resp. normed A-module).

An A-module homomorphism $\varphi:M\to N$ between two semi-normed A-modules M and N is *bounded* if the homomorphism of the underlying semi-normed Abelian groups is bounded in the sense of Definition 2.5.

A *Banach $\mathcal{A}$-module* is a normed A-module which is complete with respect to the metric Lemma 2.6.

We denote by $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ the category of Banach A-modules with bounded A-module homomorphisms as morphisms.

Definition 5.2. Let A be a semi-normed ring and M be a semi-normed A-module. There is an obvious $\hat{A}$-module structure on the completion $\hat{M}$ of A defined in Definition 2.7. We call the resulting Banach module the *completion* of M.

Definition 5.3. Let A be a non-Archimedean semi-normed ring. Consider semi-normed A-modules $(M, \|\bullet\|_M)$ and $(N, \|\bullet\|_N)$. We define the *tensor product* of $(M, \|\bullet\|_M)$ and $(N, \|\bullet\|_N)$ as the semi-normed A-module $(M \otimes N, \|\bullet\|_{M\otimes N})$, where

$$\|x\|_{M\otimes N} = \inf \max_i (\|m_i\|_M \cdot \|n_i\|_N),$$

where the infimum is taken over all decompositions $x = \sum_i m_i \otimes n_i$.

Definition 5.4. Let A be a Banach ring. Consider semi-normed A-modules M and M, we define the *complete tensor product* of M and N as the metric completion $M\hat{\otimes}_A N$ of the tensor product of M and N defined in Definition 5.3.

Theorem 5.5. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|_A)$ be a normed ring. Then $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ is a quasi-Abelian category.

Proof. We first observe that $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ is preadditive, as for any $M, N \in \mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A}(M, N)$ can be given the group structure inherited from the Abelian group $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$. It is obvious that $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ is preadditive.

Next we show that finite biproducts exist in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$. Given $(M, \|\bullet\|_M), (N, \|\bullet\|_N) \in \mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$, we set

$$(M, \|\bullet\|_M) \oplus (N, \|\bullet\|_N) := (M \oplus N, \|\bullet\|_{M\oplus N}), \tag{5.1}$$

where $\|(m, n)\|_{M\oplus N} := \|m\|_M + \|n\|_N$ for $m \in M$ and $n \in N$. It is easy to verify that this gives the biproduct in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$.

We have shown that $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ is an additive category.

Next given a morphism $\varphi : (M, \|\bullet\|_M) \to (N, \|\bullet\|_N)$ in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$, we construct its kernel $(\ker\varphi, \|\bullet\|_{\ker\varphi})$ as the kernel of the underlying homomorphism of A-modules of φ endowed with the subgroup semi-norm induced from $\|\bullet\|_M$ as in Definition 2.3. It is easy to verify that $(\ker\varphi, \|\bullet\|_{\ker\varphi})$ is the kernel of φ in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$.

We can similarly construct the cokernels. To be more precise, let $\varphi : (M, \|\bullet\|_M) \to (N, \|\bullet\|_N)$ be a morphism in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$, then the $\operatorname{coker}\varphi = \{N/\overline{\varphi(M)}\}$ with quotient norm.

We have shown that $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$ is a pre-Abelian category.

Observe that given a morphism $\varphi : (M, \|\bullet\|_M) \to (N, \|\bullet\|_N)$ in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$, its image is given by $\operatorname{Im}\varphi = \overline{\varphi(M)}$ with the subspace norm induced from N; its coimage is $M/\ker f$ with the residue norm. The morphism φ is admissible if the natural map

$$M/\ker f \to \overline{\varphi(M)}$$

is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$.

It remains to show that pull-backs preserve admissible epimorphisms and pushouts preserve admissible monomorphisms. We first handle the case of admissible epimorphisms. Consider a Cartesian square in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$:

$$\begin{tikzcd} M \arrow[r, "p"] \arrow[d, "q"] \arrow[dr, phantom, "\square"] & U \arrow[d, "f"] \\ V \arrow[r, "g"] & W \end{tikzcd}$$

with g being an admissible epimorphism. We need to show that p is also an admissible epimorphism, namely $U \cong M/\ker p$.

We define $\alpha : U \oplus V \to W$, $\alpha = (f, -g)$, then there is a natural isomorphism $j : M \to \ker\alpha$. Let us write $i : \ker\alpha \to U \oplus V$ the natural morphism. Then

$$q = \pi_V \circ i \circ j, \quad p = \pi_U \circ i \circ j,$$

where $\pi_U : U \oplus V \to U, \pi_V : U \oplus V \to V$ are the natural morphisms. We may assume that $M = \ker \alpha$ and j is the identity. Then it is obvious that p is surjective on the underlying sets. In order to compute the quotient norm on $M/\ker p$, we need a more explicit description of $\ker p \subseteq \ker \alpha$. We know that

$$\ker \alpha = \{(u, v) \in U \oplus V : f(u) = g(v)\}$$

with the subspace norm induced from the product norm on $U \oplus V$ defined in (5.1). Then

$$\ker p = \{(u, v) \in U \oplus V : u = 0, g(v) = 0\}.$$

It follows that for $(u, v) \in \ker \alpha$,

$$\inf_{(u',v')\in\ker p} \|(u, v) + (u', v')\|_{U\oplus V} = \inf_{v'\in\ker g} (\|v + v'\|_V) + \|x\|_U,$$

where $\|\bullet\|_U$ and $\|\bullet\|_V$ denote the norms on U and V respectively. By our assumption that g is an admissible epimorphism, there is a constant $C > 0$ so that

$$\inf_{v'\in\ker g} (\|v + v'\|_V) \leq C\|g(v)\|_W$$

for any $v \in V$. As f is bounded, we can also find a constant $C' > 0$ so that for any $(u, v) \in \ker \alpha$,

$$\|g(v)\|_W = \|f(u)\|_W \leq C'\|u\|_U.$$

It follows that p is admissible epimorphism.

It remains to check that the pushforwards preserve admissible monomorphisms. Consider a co-Cartesian diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{g} & U \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle q} \\ V & \xrightarrow{p} & M \end{array}$$

with g being an admissible monomorphism. We need to show that p is an adimissible monomorphism. This boils down to the following: p is injective with closed image and the norms on $p(V)$ obtained in the obvious ways are equivalent. As in the case of pull-backs, we may let $\alpha : W \to U \oplus V$ be the morphism $(g, -f)$ and assume that $M = \operatorname{coker} \alpha$. It is then easy to see that p is injective. The proof that the two norms on $p(V)$ are equivalent is parallel to the argument in the pull-back case and we omit it.

It remains to verify that $p(V)$ is closed in W. Consider the admissibly coexact sequence in $\mathcal{B}\mathrm{an}_A$:

$$W \xrightarrow{\alpha} U \oplus V \xrightarrow{\pi} M \to 0.$$

It is also admissibly coexact in the category of semi-normed A-modules. Include details later. Let $x_n \in V$ be a sequence so that $p(x_n) \to y \in M$. We may write $y = \pi(u, v)$ for some $(u, v) \in U \oplus V$. Then

$$\pi(-u, x_n - v) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. From the strict coexact sequence, we can find a sequence $w_n \in W$ so that

$$(-u - g(w_n), x_n - v + f(w_n)) \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$. Then $g(w_n) \to -u$ in U and hence there is $w \in W$ so that $w_n \to w \in W$ and $g(w) = -u$. But then $x_n \to x$ and $p(x) = y$. $\square$

Definition 5.6. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|_A)$ be a normed ring. A *Banach A-algebra* is a pair $(B, \|\bullet\|_B)$ such that $(B, \|\bullet\|_B)$ is a Banach A-module and $(B, \|\bullet\|_B)$ is a Banach ring.

6. Berkovich spectra

Definition 6.1. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|_A)$ be a Banach ring. A semi-norm $|\bullet|$ on A is *bounded* if there is a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $f \in A$, $|f| \leq C\|f\|_A$.

We write $\operatorname{Sp} A$ for the set of bounded semi-valuations on A. We call $\operatorname{Sp} A$ the *Berkovich spectrum* of A.

Later on, we will endow $\operatorname{Sp} A$ with more structures. In the literature, it is more common to denote $\operatorname{Sp} A$ by $\mathcal{M}(A)$.

Proposition 6.2. Let $(A, \|\bullet\|)$ be a Banach ring. Then $\operatorname{Sp} A$ is empty if and only if $A = 0$.

Proof. If $A = 0$, $\operatorname{Sp} A$ is clearly empty. Conversely, suppose that $\operatorname{Sp} A$ is empty. Assume that $A \neq 0$. For any maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$, by Corollary 4.5, $A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a Banach ring and $\operatorname{Sp} A/\mathfrak{m}$ is a subset of $\operatorname{Sp} A$. So we may assume that A is a field. Let S be the set of bounded semi-norms on A. Then S is non-empty as $\|\bullet\| \in S$. By Zorn's lemma, we can take a minimal element $|\bullet| \in S$. Up to replacing A by the completion with respect to $|\bullet|$, we may assume that $|\bullet|$ is a norm on A. As A is a field, we may further assume that $|\bullet| = \|\bullet\|$.

We claim that $\|\bullet\|$ is multiplicative. As A is a field, it suffices to show that $\|f^{-1}\| = \|f\|^{-1}$ for any non-zero $f \in A$. We may assume that $\|f\|^{-1} < \|f^{-1}\|$.

Let r be a positive real number. Let $\varphi : A \to A\{r^{-1}T\}/(T - f)$ be the natural map. The map is injective as A is a field. We endow $A\{r^{-1}T\}/(T - f)$ with the quotient semi-norm induced by $\|\bullet\|_r$. We still denote this semi-norm by $\|\bullet\|_r$.

We claim that $f - T$ is not invertible in $A\{r^{-1}T\}$ for the choice $r = \|f^{-1}\|^{-1}$. From this, it follows that

$$\|\varphi(f)\|_r = \|T\|_r \leq r < \|f\|.$$

The last step is our assumption. This contradicts our choice of $\|\bullet\|$.

In order to prove the claim, we need to show that $\|\bullet\|$ is power multiplicative first. Assuming this, it is obvious that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |f^{-i}| r^i = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} |f^{-1}|^i |f^{-1}|^{-i}$$

diverges.

It remains to show that $\|\bullet\|$ is power multiplicative. Suppose that is $f \in A$ so that $\|f^n\| < \|f\|^n$ for some $n > 1$. We claim that $f - T$ is not invertible in $A\{r^{-1}T\}$ for the choice $r = \|f^n\|^{1/n}$. From this,

$$\|\varphi(f)\|_r = \|T\|_r \leq r < \|f\|.$$

This contradicts our choice of $\|\bullet\|$. The claim amounts to the divergence of

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \|f^{-i}\| r^i.$$

For a general $i \geq 0$, we write $i = pn + q$ for $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q \leq n-1$. Then $\|f^i\| \leq \|f^n\|^p \|f^q\|$. So

$$\|f^{-i}\| r^i \geq \|f^i\|^{-1} \|f^n\|^{p+n^{-1}q} \geq \|f^n\|^{n^{-1}q} \|f^q\|^{-1}.$$

It therefore follows that $|f^{-i}| r^i$ admits a positive lower bound and we conclude. $\square$

7. Bornology

This section may be placed elsewhere.

Definition 7.1. Let X be a set. A *bornology* on X is a collection $\mathcal{B}$ of subsets of X such that

(1) For any $x \in X$, there is $B \in \mathcal{B}$ such that $x \in \mathcal{B}$;
(2) For any $B \in \mathcal{B}$ and any subset $A \subseteq B$, $A \in \mathcal{B}$;
(3) $\mathcal{B}$ is stable under finite union.

The pair $(X, \mathcal{B})$ is called a *bornological set*. The elements of $\mathcal{B}$ are called the *bounded subsets* of $(X, \mathcal{B})$. When $\mathcal{B}$ is obvious from the context, we omit it from the notations.

A morphism between bornological sets $(X, \mathcal{B}_X)$ and $(Y, \mathcal{B}_Y)$ is a map of sets $f : X \to Y$ such that for any $A \in \mathcal{B}_X$, $f(A) \in \mathcal{B}_Y$. Such a map is called a *bounded map*.

Definition 7.2. Let $(X, \mathcal{B})$ be a bornological set. A *basis* for $\mathcal{B}$ is a subset $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ such that for any $B \in \mathcal{B}$, there are $A_1, \ldots, A_n \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $B \subseteq A_1 \cup \cdots \cup A_n$.

Bibliography

[Ber12] V. G. Berkovich. Spectral theory and analytic geometry over non-Archimedean fields. 33. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.

[BGR84] S. Bosch, U. Güntzer, and R. Remmert. Non-Archimedean analysis. Vol. 261. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]. A systematic approach to rigid analytic geometry. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1984, pp. xii+436. URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-52229-1.