

In videos, showed that if we have an ^{exact} \mathcal{S} -functor
 $\{T_i\}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ s.t. each $T_i, i > 0$
 is cofibrable, then $\{T_i\}$ is universal,
 and so all the "satellite functors" $T_i, i > 0$
 are uniquely determined by T_0 .

Do they exist? Constructions via derived functors.

Basic procedure:

Given an right exact functor F , an object A ,

Choose a \cap complex $\rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$
 exact.

give a q -isom $P_0 \rightarrow A$

where each P_i is a projective object of \mathcal{A} .

Then we define $F_i(A) = H_i(FP_*)$

$$FP_{i+1} \rightarrow FP_i \rightarrow FP_{i-1}$$

Step 1: Projective objects

lemma let \mathcal{A} be an Abelian category,

$P \in \mathcal{A}$ then TFAE:

- 1) $\text{Hom}(P, -)$ is right exact
- 2) Every SES $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ splits
- 3) Any epic map $A \rightarrow P$ splits
- 4) given any diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & P \\
 & \swarrow & \downarrow \\
 B & \rightarrow & C \rightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

∪ bottom row exact, ∃ a map $P \rightarrow B$ s.t. diagram commutes

Pf (3 \Rightarrow 4)

Suppose 3 holds, consider

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & & P \\
 & & \downarrow f \\
 A & \xrightarrow{g} & B \rightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Define $A \times_B P = \ker (A \times P \xrightarrow{g \times \pi_1 - f \times \pi_2} B)$

note, by construction, have a comm. diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \times_B P & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & P \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\
 A & \xrightarrow{g} & B \rightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Claim: π_2 is epi

let $x \in A$, let $x \in P(x)$. Set $\bar{x} \in B(x)$ its image. since g is epi, $\exists y \in A(x)$ mapping to \bar{x} . Then $(x, -y) \in (A \times_B P)(x)$ and $\pi_2(x, -y) = x$.

By hypothesis, $A \times_B P \rightarrow P$ has a splitting and now use:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A \times_B P & \xrightarrow{\quad} & P \\
 \downarrow & \curvearrowright & \downarrow \\
 A & \xrightarrow{\quad} & B \rightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Def $P \in \mathcal{A}$ is called projective if the equiv. conditions of the lemma hold.

Main point: additive functors always preserve split exact sequences.

If P is projective, given a v. exact $F_0 = F$
 suppose we can find $G \twoheadrightarrow P$ w/ $F_1 G = 0$

$0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow G \rightarrow P \rightarrow 0$ splits
 \Rightarrow LES for $\{F_i\}$
 is actually a series of SESs.

$$F_i K \oplus F_i P = F_i G$$

Lemma: additive functors preserve split ^{short} exact sequences.

Pf. $A = B_1 \oplus B_2$ means we have

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 A & \xrightarrow{\pi_i} & B_i \\
 \swarrow \zeta_i & & \\
 & &
 \end{array}
 \quad \text{s.t. } \pi_i \zeta_i = \text{id}_{B_i}$$

$$\zeta_1 \pi_1 + \zeta_2 \pi_2 = \text{id}_A$$

D.

Projective objects

Def an Ab. cat \mathcal{A} has enough projectives if $\forall A \in \mathcal{A}, \exists P \twoheadrightarrow A$ w/ P projective.

ex: Mod_R has enough projectives.

Free modules are projective!

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & R & & \\ & \nearrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\ N & \twoheadrightarrow & M & \twoheadrightarrow & 0 \\ & \longleftarrow n & & \longleftarrow m & \end{array}$$

$$\text{Hom}_R(R, M) = M$$

easy to check: \oplus 's of projectives are projective.

Mod_R has enough projectives because any module has a generating set. $R^n \twoheadrightarrow M$

Summand of projectives are projective

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & Q_1 \oplus Q_2 = P \\ & \swarrow & \downarrow \circ \\ N & \twoheadrightarrow & M \twoheadrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Prop: An R -module M is proj. \Leftrightarrow
 $M \oplus Q = R^I$ is free for some Q

Pf: if M is proj, consider a surjection
 $R^I \twoheadrightarrow M$, which splits. \square

Ex: if $R = \text{PID}$, M f.g. proj \Rightarrow free.

if R is division, M proj \Rightarrow free.

if R is a comm. loc. ring, proj \Rightarrow free.

$$R = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z} \quad P = (\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}) / (\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$$

"
 $\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is proj, not free.

$\mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{-5}]$ has nonfree projectives.

Def A resolution of an object $A \in \mathcal{A}$ is an
 complex P_\bullet w/ a map $P_0 \rightarrow A$.
 s.t. $\dots \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$
 is exact.

it is a projective resolution if all P_i 's are projective.

Two handy lemmas:

lem 1 if $A \xrightarrow{f} B$ in \mathcal{A} and P_\bullet, Q_\bullet are
 proj. res's for A, B resp. then \exists

$$f_\bullet: P_\bullet \rightarrow Q_\bullet \text{ s.t. } \begin{array}{c} P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow A \\ \downarrow f_1 \quad \downarrow f_0 \quad \downarrow f \text{ commutes} \\ Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0 \rightarrow B \end{array}$$

and further, f_\bullet is
 unique up to homotopy equivalence.

lem 2 if $0 \rightarrow A' \rightarrow A \rightarrow A'' \rightarrow 0$ is SES.

and P'_\bullet, P''_\bullet are proj. resolutions of A', A''

then can find a proj. res P_0 of A w/ each
 $P_i \cong P_i' \oplus P_i''$, giving a SES of complexes
 $0 \rightarrow P_0' \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow P_0'' \rightarrow 0$ (split french)