

POLYLOGARITHMS AND MOTIVIC GALOIS GROUPS

A.B. GONCHAROV

Sections 1 and 2 of this paper is an enlarged version of the lecture given at the AMS conference “Motives” in Seattle, July 1991. No details can be found in [G2].

My aim is to formulate a precise conjecture about the structure of the Galois group $\text{Gal}(\mathcal{M}_T(F))$ of the category $\mathcal{M}_T(F)$ of mixed Tate motivic sheaves over $\text{Spec } F$, where F is an arbitrary field. This conjecture implies (and in fact is equivalent to) a construction of complexes $\Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ that should satisfy all the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum axioms modulo torsion.

In particular, we get a hypothetical description of $K_n(F) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ by generators and relations that generalize the definition of Milnor’s K -groups. This can be considered as a (hypothetical) generalization of the computation of $K_2(F)$ by Matsumoto-Moore ([Ma], [Mo]) and $K_3(F)$ by Suslin ([S3], see also [S2]) to all Quillen K -groups of arbitrary field. In the case when F is a number field this together with the Borel theorem ([Bo2]) would imply

Zagier’s conjecture [Z1]. *The value of the Dedekind zeta-function $\zeta_F(s)$ of an arbitrary number field F at the point n is expressed by a determinant whose entries are rational linear combinations of values of the **classical** n -logarithms at (complex embedding of) some elements of this field.*

In §3 I give a proof of Zagier’s conjecture in the case $n = 3$.

The classical polylogarithms invented by Leibniz and Joh.Bernoulli almost 300 years ago (see [Lei]) are defined on the unit disc $|z| \leq 1$ by absolutely convergent series

$$Li_n(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{n^k}.$$

They can be continued analytically to multivalued functions on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$. Their properties including the differential and functional equations play the key role in all our considerations. However the special role of the *projective line* and classical polylogarithms in the theory of mixed Tate motives remains absolutely mysterious. Formulas that led me to the conjectures about $\Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\text{Gal}(\mathcal{M}_T(F))$ are discussed in §4.

In §5 I will construct explicitly a regulator map r_3 from the motivic complex $\Gamma(X; 3)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ attached to any algebraic variety over \mathbb{C} to the third Deligne complex of $X(\mathbb{C})$. (For a generalization of this construction to motivic complexes $\Gamma(X; n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ see [G3]). Then an explicit formula for the universal motivic Chern class $c_3 \in H_{\mathcal{M}}^6(BGL_3(F)_{\bullet}, \mathbb{Q}(3))$ will be given. Applying the regulator we get a realization of c_3 in the real Deligne cohomology. I need the last result in order to complete the proof of Zagier’s conjecture.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to Sasha Beilinson and Don Zagier for many valuable discussions, suggestions, and interest. I am also grateful to

Christophe Soule for useful remarks on the previous version of the work. This paper was written during my stay at Harvard University and completed at MIT. I am grateful to both institutions for their hospitality and to Sarah Warren for excellent printing of the manuscript and pictures. Finally, I am grateful to Jan Nekovar for extremely carefull reading of the manuscript.

1. CONJECTURES

First of all I need to explain how to think about $\text{Gal}(\mathcal{M}_T(F))$. So for convenience of the reader I reproduce basic definitions from [B-D].

1.1 Mixed Tate Categories. ([B-D], see also [BMS], [B2], [D2]). A mixed Tate category is a Tannakian \mathbb{Q} -category \mathcal{M} together with a fixed invertible object $\mathbb{Q}(1)_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that

- a) Any simple object in \mathcal{M} is isomorphic to

$$\mathbb{Q}(m)_{\mathcal{M}} := \mathbb{Q}(1)_{\mathcal{M}}^{\otimes m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

- b) $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{Q}(o)_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbb{Q}(m)_{\mathcal{M}}) = \delta_{o,m}$

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(\mathbb{Q}(o)_{\mathcal{M}}, \mathbb{Q}(m)_{\mathcal{M}}) = 0 \quad \text{for } m \leq 0.$$

(I recall that ‘‘Tannakian’’ means in particular that there is a \otimes -product in \mathcal{M} ; the functor $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathbb{Q}(1)_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an equivalence of categories).

A Tate functor $F : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ between mixed Tate categories is an exact \otimes functor such that $F(\mathbb{Q}(1)_{\mathcal{M}_1}) = \mathbb{Q}(1)_{\mathcal{M}_2}$. Sometimes I will write $\mathbb{Q}(m)$ instead of $\mathbb{Q}(m)_{\mathcal{M}}$.

An object \mathcal{F} of \mathcal{M} has a canonical finite increasing filtration $\subset \mathcal{F}_{\leq i} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\leq i+1} \subset \dots$ such that $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{\leq i} / \mathcal{F}_{\leq i-1}$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of $\mathbb{Q}(-i)$ ’s. There is a canonical fiber functor to the category of finite dimensional graded \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\bullet}$:

$$\omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F}_i) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathbb{Q}(-i), \mathcal{F}_i), \quad \omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F}) := \bigoplus_i \omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F})_i.$$

Let $L(\mathcal{M})$ be the space of all derivations of $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$: an element $\varphi \in L(\mathcal{M})$ is a natural endomorphism of the functor $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\varphi_{\mathcal{F} \otimes G} = \varphi_{\mathcal{F}} \otimes \text{id}_{\omega(G)} + \text{id}_{\omega(\mathcal{F})} \otimes \varphi_G$. Then $L(\mathcal{M})$ is canonically equipped with the structure of a graded pro-Lie algebra: $L(\mathcal{M}) = \bigoplus L(\mathcal{M})_i$, where

$$L(\mathcal{M})_i := \{\varphi \in L(\mathcal{M}) \mid \varphi(\mathcal{F}) : \omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F})_{\bullet} \rightarrow \omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F})_{\bullet+i}\}.$$

(Recall that ‘‘graded pro-Lie algebra’’ is a projective limit of finite dimensional graded Lie algebras) It is easy to prove that $L(\mathcal{M})_i = 0$ for $i \geq 0$. Such Lie algebras are called mixed Tate pro-Lie algebras. For any mixed Tate Lie algebra L the category $L\text{-mod}$ of finite dimensional graded continuous L -modules is a mixed Tate category. The object $\mathbb{Q}(1)$ in this category is \mathbb{Q} with trivial action of L placed in degree -1 ; the fiber functor $\omega : L\text{-mod} \rightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\bullet}$ is just forgetting of L -action functor. For any mixed Tate category \mathcal{M} the fiber functor $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ lifts canonically to the Tate functor $\omega_{\mathcal{M}} : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow L(\mathcal{M})\text{-mod}$. It is easy to prove that $\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ is an equivalence of categories. Note that any Tate functor $F : \mathcal{M}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_2$ commutes with ω ’s and so defines the morphism $F_{\bullet} : L(\mathcal{M}_1)_{\bullet} \rightarrow L(\mathcal{M}_2)_{\bullet}$ of corresponding mixed Tate algebras. For an object $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{M}$

$$H_{\mathcal{M}}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{F}) := \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}}^{\bullet}(\mathbb{Q}(o), \mathcal{F}) = H^{\bullet}(L(\mathcal{M})_{\bullet}, \omega_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{F})) \quad (1)$$

Remark. Let $G(\mathcal{M})$ be a prounipotent group with the Lie algebra $L(\mathcal{M})$. Note that $G(\mathcal{M})$ acts on any continuous $L(\mathcal{M})$ -module. There is a semidirect product $G_m \times G(\mathcal{M})$ where G_m is the multiplicative group and the action of G_m on $G(\mathcal{M})$ provides the grading on $L(\mathcal{M})$ -modules. So the category of finite dimensional graded continuous $L(\mathcal{M})$ -modules is canonically isomorphic to the category of $G_m \times G(\mathcal{M})$ finite dimensional continuous modules.

1.2 The motivic Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$. A.A. Beilinson conjectured ([B1]) that for arbitrary field F there exists a mixed Tate category $\mathcal{M}_T(F)$ of mixed motivic Tate sheaves over $\text{Spec } F$ such that

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}_T(F)}^i(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n)) \cong gr_\gamma^n K_{2n-i}(F)_\mathbb{Q} \quad (2)$$

where γ is the γ -filtration on K -groups (see [So]) and for an abelian group A we put $A_\mathbb{Q} := A \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Let $L(F)_\bullet = \bigoplus_{n=1}^\infty L(F)_{-n}$ be the corresponding mixed Tate Lie algebra. Its cohomology $H^i(L(F)_\bullet, \mathbb{Q})$ (we will often use a notation $H^i(L(F)_\bullet)$) has a natural grading by positive integers because $L(F)_\bullet$ itself is a negatively graded Lie algebra (see example 1.2 below). Let us denote by $H_{(n)}^i(L(F)_\bullet)$ the part of degree n with respect to this grading. Then axiom (1.2) means that

$$H_{(n)}^i(L(F)_\bullet) = gr_\gamma^n K_{2n-i}(F)_\mathbb{Q}. \quad (3)$$

Moreover, this isomorphism should be compatible with natural products on $H^*(L(F)_\bullet)$ and $K_*(F)$. It also should be functorial with respect to embeddings of fields $i : F \hookrightarrow E$. (More precisely the corresponding morphism of schemes $\tilde{i} : \text{Spec } E \rightarrow \text{Spec } F$ should lift to a morphism of mixed Tate categories $\tilde{i}^* : \mathcal{M}_T(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T(E)$ commuting with the fiber functors, and so provide us with a homomorphism of the Lie algebras $\tilde{i}_\bullet : L(E)_\bullet \rightarrow L(F)_\bullet$). The Galois group $\text{Gal}(\mathcal{M}_T(F))$ is by definition the semidirect product $G_m \times G(\mathcal{M}_T(F))$ (see above).

This conjecture gives a new point of view on algebraic K -theory. Let me give some examples demonstrating how powerful it is.

Example 1.1 $H^i(L(F)_\bullet) = 0$ for $i < 0$ and $H_{(n)}^0(L(F)_\bullet) = 0$ for $n > 0$. So $gr_\gamma^n K_m(F)_\mathbb{Q} = 0$ for $m \geq 2n > 0$. But this is just Beilinson-Soulé conjecture.

Example 1.2 The degree n part of the standard cochain complex $(\Lambda^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet)^\vee, \partial)$ of the Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$ forms a subcomplex $(\Lambda_{(n)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet)^\vee, \partial)$:

$$L_{-n}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial} L_{-2}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^{n-2} L_{-1}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \Lambda^n L_{-1}^\vee \quad (4)$$

(we write L_{-n} instead of $L(F)_{-n}$). In particular it is concentrated in degrees $[1, n]$. $(\Lambda_{(n)}^m(L(F)_\bullet)^\vee) = 0$ for $m > n$ because $L(F)_\bullet$ is graded by strictly negative integers. So according to (1.3) $gr_\gamma^n K_m(F)_\mathbb{Q} = 0$ for $m < n$. This is a well known theorem in K -theory that follows from results of A.A. Suslin [S1] (see [So].)

Example 1.3 (Relation with Milnor K -theory). Applying (1.3) in the simplest case $i = n = 1$ we get

$$H_{(1)}^1(L(F)_\bullet) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L(F)_{-1}^\vee \stackrel{(1.3)}{=} K_1(F)_\mathbb{Q} = F_\mathbb{Q}^*. \quad (5)$$

Here $W \rightarrow W^\vee$ is the duality between \varprojlim and \varinjlim of finite dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces: $(W^\vee)^\vee = W$. The structure of an \varinjlim of finite dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector space

on $F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ is defined as follows. Let $\mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$ be the free abelian group generated by symbols $\{x\}$ where x runs through all F -points of the projective line P^1 . Let us denote by $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$ the subgroup generated by symbols $\{\infty\}, \{0\}, \{xy\} - \{x\} - \{y\}$ ($x, y \in F^*$). Then there is canonical isomorphism

$$\mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]/\mathcal{R}_1(F) \rightarrow F^*; \quad \{x\} \mapsto x; \{\infty\}, \{0\} \mapsto 1.$$

Both $\mathbb{Q}[P_F^1] := \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathcal{R}_1(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ are \lim_{\rightarrow} of finite dimensional \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces, so we get the same structure on $F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$.

Now look at the degree 2 part of the cochain complex of $L(F)$. (We use (1.5)):

$$L_{-2}^{\vee} \xrightarrow{\partial} \Lambda^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*.$$

According to (1.3) $\text{Coker } \partial = K_2(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. So by Matsumoto-Moore theorem $\text{Im } \partial$ is generated by symbols $(1-x) \wedge x$. Hence we get a homomorphism of complexes, where $\delta : \{x\} \mapsto (1-x) \wedge x$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Q}[P_F^1] & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \Lambda^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \\ \downarrow & & \parallel \\ L(F)_{-2}^{\vee} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \Lambda^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \end{array}$$

Further,

$$\partial(L_{-2}^{\vee} \otimes \wedge^{n-2} L_{-1}^{\vee}) = \partial(L_{-2}^{\vee}) \wedge \wedge^{n-2} L_{-1}^{\vee},$$

so

$$H_{(n)}^n(L(F)_{\bullet}) = K_n^M(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} := \frac{\wedge^n F^*}{(1-x) \wedge x \wedge \wedge^{n-2} F^*} \otimes \mathbb{Q}.$$

(Here $K_*^M(F)$ is the Milnor ring of the field F (see [M])). Comparing with (1.3) we obtain $gr_{\gamma}^n K_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} = K_n^M(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$. More precisely we get the following: multiplication in $K_*(F)$ induces a map $m : K_1(F) \times \dots \times K_1(F) \rightarrow K_n(F)$ that factorizes through a map $s : K_n^M(F) \rightarrow K_n(F)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F^* \times \dots \times F^* & \xrightarrow{m} & K_n(F) \\ & \searrow & \nearrow s \\ & & K_n^M(F) \end{array}$$

Then the composition $K_n^M(F) \rightarrow K_n(F) \xrightarrow{K_n^M(F)} gr_{\gamma}^n K_n(F)$ is an isomorphism modulo torsion. But this is the well known theorem of A.A. Suslin [S1]. (In fact Suslin proved that it is an isomorphism modulo $(n-1)!$.)

Example 1.4 Complexes $(\wedge_{(n)}^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee}), \partial)$ should satisfy the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum axioms modulo torsion (see [B1] and [L1]).

More precisely, the (hypothetical) properties of the Lie algebra $L(F)_{\bullet}$ provide most of all axioms: these complexes are concentrated in degrees $[1, n]$ by definition; relation with algebraic K -theory is given by (1.3); the DGA structure of $\wedge^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee})$ gives a morphism of complexes

$$(\wedge_{(n)}^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee}), \partial) \otimes (\wedge_{(m)}^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee}), \partial) \rightarrow (\wedge_{(n+m)}^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee}), \partial)$$

and example 1.3 shows that

$$H^n(\wedge_{(n)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet^\vee)) = K_n^M(F)_\mathbb{Q}.$$

The only axiom that remains unclear from this point of view is the existence of the transfer

$$(\wedge_{(n)}^\bullet(L(E)_\bullet^\vee)) \rightarrow (\wedge_{(n)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet^\vee))$$

for a finite extension of fields $F \subset E$. On the other hand, if we know something about $K_*(F)_\mathbb{Q}$, then conjecture (1.3) provides us with some information about the structure of the Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$.

Example 1.5 Let F be a number field. Then it is well-known that $gr_\gamma^n K_m(F)_\mathbb{Q} \neq 0$ only if $m = 2n - 1$. So $H^i(L(F)_\bullet) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$ and hence $L(F)_\bullet$ is a free graded Lie algebra. Further, A. Borel proved ([Bo1-2], see also s.2 of §2) that for $m > 1$

$$\dim K_{2m-1}(F)_\mathbb{Q} = d_m := \begin{cases} r_1 + r_2, & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \\ r_2, & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

So $L(F)_\bullet$ is generated by $(F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee$ in degree -1 and vector spaces of dimension d_m in degrees $-m = -2, -3, \dots$

Example 1.6 F is a finite field. Then $K_*(F)_\mathbb{Q} = 0$, (see [Q2]), so $L(F)_\bullet = 0$. This agrees with the fact that the category $\mathcal{M}_T(F)$ should be semisimple because Frobenius acts on simple objects $\mathbb{Q}(j)$ with different eigenvalues q^{-j} .

Let us denote by F_0 the subfield of constants in a field F (i.e. F_0 is the algebraic closure in F of the prime field).

Rigidity Conjecture 1.7 (A.A. Beilinson) *The canonical map $K_*(F_0) \rightarrow K_*(F)$ induces an isomorphism $gr_\gamma^n K_{2n-1}1(F_0) \xrightarrow{\sim} gr_\gamma^n K_{2n-1}(F)$ for $n \geq 2$.*

Example 1.8 Now let $\text{char } F = p > 0$. Then example 1.6 together with the rigidity conjecture implies that $gr_\gamma^n K_{2n-1}(F_0)_\mathbb{Q}$ should be zero for $n \geq 2$. This means that $L(F)_\bullet$ is generated by $(F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee$ sitting in degree -1 .

3. The structure of $L(F)_\bullet$. Set

$$I(F)_\bullet := \bigoplus_{n=2}^\infty L(F)_{-n}$$

Conjecture 1.9 $I(F)_\bullet$ is a free graded Lie algebra.

Our next aim is to construct explicitly the quotient $L_\bullet/[I_\bullet, I_\bullet]$. There is the following extension

$$0 \rightarrow I_\bullet/[I_\bullet, I_\bullet] \rightarrow L_\bullet/[I_\bullet, I_\bullet] \rightarrow L_\bullet/I_\bullet \rightarrow 0. \quad (7)$$

Let \mathfrak{n} be a nilpotent Lie algebra. Then $H_1(\mathfrak{n}) = \mathfrak{n}/[\mathfrak{n}, \mathfrak{n}]$ can be interpreted as a space of generators of \mathfrak{n} (as a Lie algebra) and $H_2(\mathfrak{n})$ as a space of relations between generators; \mathfrak{n} is free if and only if $H_2(\mathfrak{n}) = 0$. If \mathfrak{n} is free then $H_i(\mathfrak{n}) = 0$ for $i \geq 2$.

Returning to (1.7) we see that the left space in (1.6) is just the space of generators of I_\bullet . So conjecture 1.9 together with explicit construction of extension (1.7) will give us in particular a complete description of the ideal I_\bullet . The quotient L_\bullet/I_\bullet is abelian and as a \mathbb{Q} -vector space is isomorphic to $L_{-1}^\vee \cong (F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee$ (see (1.5)). The including $L_{-1} \hookrightarrow L_\bullet$ provides canonical splitting $s : L_\bullet/I_\bullet \rightarrow L_\bullet/[I_\bullet, I_\bullet]$ of (1.7) as an extension of \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces; the action of L_\bullet on I_\bullet gives the action of L_\bullet/I_\bullet

on $H_1(I_\bullet)$. Let $H_1^{(-n)}(I_\bullet)$ be the component of grading $-n$ of $H_1(I_\bullet)$. Then to construct $L_\bullet/[I_\bullet, I_\bullet]$ we need the following data:

$$\text{i) A graded } \mathbb{Q}\text{-vector space } H_1(I_\bullet) = \bigoplus_{n=+2}^{\infty} H_1^{(-n)}(I_\bullet) \quad (1.8a)$$

$$\text{ii) A map } (F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee \wedge (F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee \rightarrow H_1^{(2)}(I_\bullet) \quad (1.8b)$$

(this will be the commutator $[s(L_\bullet/I_\bullet), s(L_\bullet/I_\bullet)]$)

$$\text{iii) Maps } (F_\mathbb{Q}^*)^\vee \otimes H_1^{-(n-1)}(I_\bullet) \rightarrow H_1^{(-n)}(I_\bullet) \quad (1.8c)$$

Dualising (1.8) we get

$$f_2 : H_{(2)}^1(I_\bullet) \rightarrow \wedge^2 F_\mathbb{Q}^* \quad (1.9a)$$

$$f_n : H_{(n)}^1(I_\bullet) \rightarrow H_{(n-1)}^1(I_\bullet) \otimes F_\mathbb{Q}^* \quad (1.9b)$$

These data will be defined in the next section.

4. The groups $\mathcal{R}_n(F)$. Let us define by induction subgroups $\mathcal{R}_n(F) \subset \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$, $n \geq 1$. Set

$$\mathcal{B}_n(F) := \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]/\mathcal{R}_n(F)$$

The subgroup $\mathcal{R}_1(F)$ was already defined in such a way that $\mathcal{B}_1(F) = F^*$:

$$\mathcal{R}_1(F) := (\{x\} + \{y\} - \{xy\}, (x, y \in F^*); \{0\}; \{\infty\}).$$

Consider homomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] &\xrightarrow{\delta_n} \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F) \otimes F^* & : n \geq 3 \\ \wedge^2 F^* & : n = 2 \end{cases} \\ \delta_n : \{x\} &\mapsto \begin{cases} \{x\}_{n-1} \otimes x & : n \geq 3 \\ (1-x) \wedge x & : n = 2 \end{cases} \\ \delta_n : \{\infty\}, \{0\}, \{1\} &\mapsto 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Here $\{x\}_n$ is the projection of $\{x\}$ in $\mathcal{B}_n(F)$. Set

$$\mathcal{A}_n(F) := \text{Ker } \delta_n.$$

Any element $\alpha(t) = \sum n_i \{f_i(t)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_{F(t)}^1]$ has a specialization $\alpha(t_0) := \sum n_i \{f_i(t_0)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$, $t_0 \in P_F^1$. (It is correctly defined even if t_0 is a pole of $f_i(t)$, in this case $f_i(t_0) = \infty \in P_F^1$).

Definition 1.10 $\mathcal{R}_n(F)$ is generated by elements $\alpha(0) - \alpha(1)$ where $\alpha(t)$ runs through all elements of $\mathcal{A}_n(F(t))$, and also $\{\infty\}, \{0\}$.

Lemma 1.11 $\delta_n(\mathcal{R}_n(F)) = 0$.

Proof. See proof of lemma 1.16 in [G2]. □

So we get

$$\delta : \mathcal{B}_n(F) \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F) \otimes F^* & : n \geq 3 \\ \wedge^2 F^* & : n = 2 \end{cases}$$

Let me give some examples of elements of $\mathcal{R}_n(F)$.

Example 1.12 $\{x\} + \{x^{-1}\}$ and $\{x\} + \{1-x\} \in \mathcal{R}_2(F)$. Indeed, $\delta_2(\{x\} + \{x^{-1}\}) = (1-x) \wedge x + (1-x^{-1}) \wedge x^{-1} = 0$ in $\wedge^2 F(t)^*$ modulo 2-torsion. On the other hand, $\{x\} + \{x^{-1}\}|_{x=\infty} \in \mathcal{R}_2(F)$ by definition. The same arguments work for $\{x\} + \{1-x\}$.

Example 1.13 $\{x\} + (-1)^n \{x^{-1}\} \in \mathcal{R}_n(F)$. Indeed, by induction $\delta_n(\{x\} + (-1)^n \{x^{-1}\}) = (\{x\} + (-1)^{n-1} \{x\}) \otimes x \in \mathcal{R}_{n-1}(F(t)) \otimes F(t)^*$ and $\{x\} + (-1)^n \{x^{-1}\}|_{x=\infty} \in \mathcal{R}_n(F)$ by definition. In particular, $2 \cdot \{1\} \in \mathcal{R}_{2m}(F)$. (Put $x = 1, n = 2m$). We will prove in the next section that $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{R}_{2m+1}(\mathbb{C})$ (see example 1.18).

5. Motivation: polylogarithms. The classical n -logarithm can be defined on the unit disk $|z| \leq 1$ by absolutely convergent series

$$Li_n(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{z^k}{k^n}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} Li_1(z) &= -\log(1-z) \\ d Li_n(z) &= Li_{n-1}(z) d \log z. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

So using the formula

$$Li_n(z) = \int_0^z Li_{n-1}(w) \frac{dw}{w}$$

we can continue analytically $Li_n(z)$ to a multivalued analytic function on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$. However n -logarithm has a remarkable single-valued version:

$$\mathcal{L}_n(z) := \begin{cases} \text{Re} & (n : \text{odd}) \\ \text{Im} & (n : \text{even}) \end{cases} \left(\sum_{k=0}^n \frac{B_k \cdot 2^k}{k!} \log^k |z| \cdot Li_{n-k}(z) \right), \quad n \geq 2$$

$$\mathcal{L}_1(z) := \log |z|$$

Here $B_0 = 1, B_1 = -\frac{1}{2}, B_2 = \frac{1}{6} \dots$ are Bernoulli numbers. Let me note that

$$\mathcal{L}_2(z) = \text{Im} (Li_2(z)) + \arg(1-z) \log |z| \quad (12)$$

is the well-known Bloch-Wigner function, and

$$\mathcal{L}_3(z) = \text{Re}(Li_3(z) - \log |z| \cdot Li_2(z) - \frac{1}{3} \log^2 |z| \log(1-z))$$

was used in [G1]. The functions $\mathcal{L}_n(z)$ for arbitrary n were written by D. Zagier [Z1], who proved the following theorem:

Theorem 1.14 $\mathcal{L}_n(z)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ for $n \geq 2$.

It is clear that then $\mathcal{L}_n(z)$ is real-analytic on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$.

The Hodge-theoretical interpretation of these functions was given by A.A. Beilinson and P. Deligne (see, for example, [D2]).

Any real-valued function, and in particular $\mathcal{L}_n(z)$, defines a homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n : \mathbb{Z}[P_{\mathbb{C}}^1] &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \{z\} &\mapsto \mathcal{L}_n(z). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem-motivation 1.15 $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n(\mathcal{R}_n(\mathbb{C})) = 0$

Proof. Let us first prove the theorem for $n = 2$

Lemma 1.16 Let $\alpha(t) = \sum n_i \{f_i(t)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_{\mathbb{C}(t)}^1]$. If

$$\delta_2 \alpha(t) := \sum n_i (1 - f_i(t)) \wedge f_i(t) = 0$$

in $\wedge^2 \mathbb{C}(t)^*$ then $d(\sum n_i \mathcal{L}_2(f_i(z))) = 0$.

It follows immediately from the lemma that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2(\alpha(0) - \alpha(1)) = 0$ and so $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2(\mathcal{R}_2(\mathbb{C})) = 0$.

Proof of Lemma 1.16 Let us consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}[P_{\mathbb{C}(t)}^1] & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & \wedge^2 \mathbb{C}(t)^* \\ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow r_2 \\ S^0(\mathbb{C}P^1) & \xrightarrow{d} & S^1(\mathbb{C}P^1) \end{array} \quad (1.13)$$

$$r_2(f \wedge g) := -\log |f| d \arg g + \log |g| d \arg f .$$

Here $S^i(\mathbb{C}P^1)$ is the space of smooth i -forms each defined on an appropriate Zariski open domain of $\mathbb{C}P^1$ ($= C^\infty$ i -forms at the generic point of $\mathbb{C}P^1$).

The formula

$$d\mathcal{L}_2(z) = -\log |1 - z| d \arg z + \log |z| d \arg(1 - z)$$

provides the commutativity of the diagram (1.13). So if $\alpha(t) \in \mathcal{A}_2(\mathbb{C}(t))$, then

$$0 = r_2 \circ \delta_2(\alpha(t)) = d \circ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_2(\alpha(t)) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d(\sum n_i \mathcal{L}_2(f_i(z))) .$$

Set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_n(z) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_n(z) & n : \text{odd} \\ i\mathcal{L}_n(z) & n : \text{even} \end{cases}$$

Then we have for $n \geq 3$

$$\begin{aligned} d\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_n(z) &= \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(z) d(i \arg z) - \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} \frac{B_k \cdot 2^k}{k!} \log^{k-1} |z| \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-k}(z) \cdot d \log |z| \\ &\quad - \frac{B_{n-1} \cdot 2^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \log^{n-2} |z| (\log |z| d \log |1 - z| - \log |1 - z| d \log |z|) . \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

It is interesting that in this formula the same coefficients appear as in (1.12).

The proof of the theorem in the case $n \geq 3$ is based on this formula and the following commutative diagram it provides

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Z}[P_{\mathbb{C}(t)}^1] & \longrightarrow & B_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^* \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \downarrow & & \downarrow r_n \\ S^0(\mathbb{C}P^1) & \xrightarrow{d} & S^1(\mathbb{C}P^1) \end{array}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_n(\{f(t)\}_{n-1} \otimes g(t)) &:= \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-1}(f(t)) di \arg g(t) - \\
 &- \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} \frac{B_k \cdot 2^k}{k!} \log^{k-1} |f(t)| \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{n-k}(f(t)) d \log |g(t)| - \\
 &- \frac{B_{n-1} \cdot 2^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \log |g(t)| \cdot \log^{n-3} |f(t)| \cdot (\log |f(t)| d \log |1-f(t)| - \\
 &- \log |1-f(t)|) d \log |f(t)|
 \end{aligned}$$

There are 3 terms in this formula. Each of them is a homomorphism from $B_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^*$ to $S^1(\mathbb{C}P^1)$: the first by induction; the second because it is a composition of the homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^* & \longrightarrow & B_{n-k}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes S^{k-1}\mathbb{C}(t)^* \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^* \\
 \delta(k-1) \otimes id \searrow & & \nearrow id \otimes \text{projection} \otimes id \\
 & & B_{n-k}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \underbrace{\mathbb{C}(t)^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^*}_{k \text{ times}}
 \end{array}$$

($\delta(1) := \delta$ and $\delta(k) := (\delta \otimes id) \circ \delta(k-1)$) with the obvious homomorphism from $B_{n-k}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes S^{k-1}\mathbb{C}(t)^* \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)$ to $S^1(\mathbb{C}P^1)$; and finally the third one is the composition of the homomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B_{n-1}(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^* & \longrightarrow & \wedge^2 \mathbb{C}(t)^* \otimes S^{n-2}\mathbb{C}(t)^* \\
 \delta(n-3) \otimes id \searrow & & \nearrow \delta \otimes \text{projection} \\
 & & B_2(\mathbb{C}(t)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^* \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbb{C}(t)^*
 \end{array}$$

with $r_2 \otimes \square \log |\cdot|$.

For another formula for $d\mathcal{L}_n(z)$ (without Bernoulli numbers on the right-hand side) see [Z1], where D. Zagier suggests a slightly different definition of the “subgroup of functional equations” for $\mathcal{L}_n(z)$.

Theorem 1.17 *Suppose that for some $f_i(t) \in \mathbb{C}(t)$ we have $\sum_i a_i \mathcal{L}_n(f_i(t)) = 0$. Then for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$*

$$\sum_i a_i (\{f_i(z)\} - \{f_i(0)\}) \in \mathcal{R}_n(\mathbb{C}) .$$

See proposition 4.9 for the case $n = 2$. The proof in the general case follows the same idea: to study singularities of $d(\sum a_i \mathcal{L}_n(f_i(t)))$ using formula (1.14) \square

Theorem 1.5 permits us to prove that the quotient $\mathcal{A}_n(F)/\mathcal{R}_n(F)$ can be non-trivial. The simplest example is:

Example 1.18 $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{R}_{2n+1}(\mathbb{C})$ because $\mathcal{L}_{2n+1}(1) = \zeta_{\mathbb{Q}}(2n+1) \neq 0$. (Compare with example 1.13 where we proved that $2 \cdot \{1\} \in \mathcal{R}_{2n}(F)$.)

Remark Let us denote by $F(X)$ the field of rational functions on a curve X/F . The proof of theorem 1.15 suggest

Definition 1.19 $\mathcal{R}'_n(F)$ is generated by elements $\alpha(t_0) - \alpha(t_1)$ where t_0, t_1 runs all F -points of X , X runs all curves over F and $\alpha(t)$ runs all elements of $\mathcal{A}_n(F(X))$.

The previous definition uses only P^1 instead of all curves over F . However, I believe that the natural map $\mathcal{R}_n(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'_n(F)$ is an isomorphism. In fact this is equivalent to the rigidity conjecture 1.7 (see s. 9 of §1 in [G2]).

6. The main conjecture. Now we are ready to formulate the conjecture about the structure of the Lie algebra $L(F)_{\bullet}$. As explained in s. 3 to describe the ideal I_{\bullet} and extension

$$0 \rightarrow H_1(I_{\bullet}) \rightarrow L_{\bullet}/[I_{\bullet}, I_{\bullet}] \rightarrow L_{\bullet}/I_{\bullet} \rightarrow 0$$

$$\parallel$$

$$(F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*)^{\vee}$$

it is sufficient to define the following data (see (1.9)).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{i)} \quad & H^1(I_{\bullet}) = \bigoplus_{n=2}^{\infty} H^1_{(n)}(I_{\bullet}) \\ \text{ii)} \quad & f_2 : H^1_{(2)}(I_{\bullet}) \rightarrow \wedge^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \\ \text{iii)} \quad & f_n : H^1_{(n)}(I_{\bullet}) \rightarrow H^1_{(n-1)}(I_{\bullet}) \otimes F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

Conjecture 1.20 For an arbitrary field F

- a) $I(F)_{\bullet}$ is a free graded pro-Lie algebra
- b) $H^1_{(n)}(I(F)_{\bullet}) \cong \mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ $n \geq 2$, i.e. $I(F)_{\bullet}$ is generated as a graded Lie algebra by the spaces $\mathcal{B}_n(F)^{\vee}$ sitting in degree $-n$.
- c) $L_{\bullet}/I_{\bullet} \cong (F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*)^{\vee}$ and f_n coincides with

$$\delta : \mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* & : n \geq 3 \\ \wedge^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* & : n = 2 \end{cases}$$

2. COROLLARIES

1. A candidate for the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum complexes. Let us compute $H^*_{(n)}(L(F)_{\bullet})$ using the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence for the ideal I_{\bullet} and conjecture 1.20. We get


$$E_1^{p,q} = C^p(L_{\bullet}/I_{\bullet}, H^q_{(n-p)}(I_{\bullet})) = \begin{cases} \wedge^p F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \otimes \mathcal{B}_{n-p}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} & : q = 1 \\ \wedge^n F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* & : q = 0, n = p \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The action of L_{\bullet}/I_{\bullet} on $\bigoplus_{m=2}^{\infty} H_1^{(-m)}(I_{\bullet})$ is given by maps f_m^* dual to f_m ($m \geq 3$). So the differential

$$d_1^{p,1} : \mathcal{B}_{n-p}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \wedge^p F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n-p-1}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \wedge^{p+1} F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$$

is given by the formula ($n - p \geq 3$)

$$\delta : \{x\}_{n-p} \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_p \mapsto \{x\}_{n-p-1} \otimes x \wedge y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_p$$



The only non-trivial higher differential is

$$d_2^{n-2,1} : \mathcal{B}_2(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \wedge^{n-2} F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \rightarrow \wedge^n F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$$

$$\{x\}_2 \otimes y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-2} \mapsto (1-x) \wedge x \wedge y_1 \wedge \dots \wedge y_{n-2} .$$

So we get the following complex $\Gamma(F, n)$:

$$\mathcal{B}_n \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \otimes F^* \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_{n-2} \otimes \wedge^2 F^* \dots \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_2 \otimes \wedge^{n-2} F^* \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^n F^*$$

where $\mathcal{B}_n \equiv \mathcal{B}_n(F)$ placed in degree 1 and

$$\delta : \{x\}_p \otimes \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-p} y_i \rightarrow \delta(\{x\}_p) \wedge \bigwedge_{i=1}^{n-p} y_i$$

has degree +1. Conjecture 1.20 together with (1.3) implies

Conjecture 2.1 $H^i(\Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong gr_{\gamma}^n K_{2n-i}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$

This conjecture gives a description of K -groups in terms of symbols.

Example Let $F = \mathbb{Q}$. We showed in example 1.18 that $\{1\} \notin \mathcal{R}_{2n+1}(\mathbb{Q})$ for $n \geq 1$. So $\{1\}$ should represent a non-trivial element in $gr_{\gamma}^{2n+1} K_{4n+1}(\mathbb{Q})$. Note

$$\text{that } \dim K_m(\mathbb{Q}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } m = 4n + 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Complexes $\Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ should satisfy Beilinson- Lichtenbaum axioms.

In fact conjecture 2.1 is equivalent to conjecture 1.20 if we assume (1.3). More precisely, let us suppose that there exist homomorphisms $\psi_n : \mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow L(F)_{-n}^{\vee}$ such that the following diagrams are commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}_2(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \wedge^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \\ \psi_2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \wedge^2 \psi_1 \\ L(F)_{-2}^{\vee} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \wedge^2 L(F)_{-1}^{\vee} \end{array} \quad (2.1a)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \\
\psi_n \downarrow & & \downarrow \psi_{n-1} \otimes \psi_1 \\
L(F)_{-n}^{\vee} & \xrightarrow{\partial_{(1)}} & L(F)_{-(n-1)}^{\vee} \otimes L(F)_{-1}^{\vee}
\end{array} \tag{2.1b}$$

Here $\partial_{(1)}$ is the $L_{-(n-1)}^{\vee} \otimes L_{-1}^{\vee}$ -component of Δ . Then we get a homomorphism of complexes

$$\Psi_n : \Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \wedge_{(n)}^{\bullet}(L(F)_{\bullet}^{\vee}). \tag{2}$$

Theorem 2.2 *Suppose that there exists a graded Lie algebra $L_{\bullet} = \bigoplus_{n=1}^{\infty} L_{-n}$ and homomorphisms $\psi_n : \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow L_{-n}^{\vee}$ such that diagrams 2.1a), 2.1b) are commutative and Ψ_n is a quasisisomorphism for $n \geq 1$. Then*

- a) $I_{\bullet} := \bigoplus_{n=2}^{\infty} L_{-n}$ is a free graded Lie algebra
- b) $\psi_n : \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow H_{(n)}^1(I_{\bullet})$ is an isomorphism for any $n \geq 2$
- c) Maps f_n describing the quotient $L_{\bullet}/[I_{\bullet}, I_{\bullet}]$ (see (1.15)) coincide with

$$\delta : \mathcal{B}_n \rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathcal{B}_{n-1} \otimes F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* & : n \geq 3 \\ \wedge^2 F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* & : n = 2 \end{cases}$$

For the proof of the theorem, see proof of proposition 1.26 in [G2] \square

Our next purpose will be to show that conjecture 2.1 in the case when F is a number field implies Zagier's conjecture about the values of Dedekind zeta functions $\zeta_F(n)$. But first of all we need to recall the Borel theorems.

2. The Borel theorems. Set $\mathbb{R}(n) = (2\pi i)^n \mathbb{R} \subset \mathbb{C}$ and $X_F := \mathbb{Z}^{\text{Hom}(F, \mathbb{C})}$. Let us define the Borel regulator $r_m : K_{2m-1}(F) \rightarrow X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1)$. The Hurewicz map gives a canonical homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
K_{2m-1}(F) &:= \pi_{2m-1}(BGL(F)^+) \rightarrow H_{2m-1}(BGL(F)^+, \mathbb{Z}) = \\
&= H_{2m-1}(GL(F), \mathbb{Z}).
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

For every embedding $\sigma : F \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ we have a homomorphism

$$H_{2m-1}(GL(F), \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_{2m-1}(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}). \tag{4}$$

There is a canonical pairing

$$H^{2m-1}(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}(m-1)) \times H_{2m-1}(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\leq, \geq} \mathbb{R}(m-1). \tag{5}$$

Let us define a canonical element

$$b_{2m-1} \in H_{cts}^{2m-1}(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}(m-1)) \subset H^{2m-1}(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}(m-1)).$$

Recall that (cf. [V-E]) $H_{cts}^*(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}) \cong H_{\text{top}}^*(U, \mathbb{R})$ where $H_{\text{top}}^*(U, \mathbb{R})$ is the cohomology of the infinite unitary group, considered as a topological space. Further ([Bo1]),

$$H_{\text{top}}^*(U, \mathbb{Z}) = H^*(S^1 \times S^3 \times S^5 \times \dots, \mathbb{Z}) = \wedge_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(u_1, u_3, \dots)$$

where u_i denotes the class of the sphere S^i .

Combining the above isomorphisms we get an isomorphism

$$\varphi : H_{cts}^*(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \wedge_{\mathbb{Z}}^*(u_1, u_3, \dots) \otimes \mathbb{R}. \tag{6}$$

Set $b'_{m-1} := 2\pi \cdot \varphi^{-1}(u_{2m-1})$ and

$$b_{2m-1} := (2\pi i)^{m-1} \cdot b'_{2m-1} \in H_{\text{cts}}^*(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}(m-1)).$$

So combining this with (2.3)–(2.5) we get

$$K_{2m-1}(F) \longrightarrow \oplus_{\text{Hom}(F, \mathbb{C})} K_{2m-1}(\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1).$$

It is known that if $\lambda \in H_{\text{cont}}^d(GL(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R})$ and c^* denotes the involution defined by complex conjugation c , then in (2.6) $c^*\varphi(\lambda) = (-1)^d\varphi(c^*\lambda)$, where c acts also on $S^{2m-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^m$. Note that $c^*u_{2m-1} = (-1)^m u_{2m-1}$. So we see that

$$r_m : K_{2m-1}(F) \longrightarrow [X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1)]^+ = \mathbb{R}^{d_m}$$

where on the right-hand side stands the subspace of invariants of the action of c and

$$d_m = \begin{cases} r_1 + r_2, & \text{if } m \text{ is odd} \\ r_2, & \text{if } m \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

is its dimension. Here r_1 resp. r_2 the number of re[Bal] resp. complex places, so $[F : \mathbb{Q}] = r_1 + 2r_2$.

In fact, we have constructed a homomorphism

$$r_m^{(n)} : \text{Prim } H_{2m-1}(GL_n(F), \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow [X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1)]^+.$$

For any lattice Λ of $(X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1))^+$ define its (co)volume $\text{vol } \Lambda$ by

$$\det(\Lambda) = \text{vol}(\Lambda) \cdot \det[X_F(m-1)^+].$$

Theorem 2.3 (Borel [Bo1], [Bo2]). *For every $m \geq 2$ and sufficiently large n*

- a) $\text{Im } r_m^{(n)}$ is a lattice in $(X_F \otimes \mathbb{R}(m-1))^+$.
- b) $R_m := \text{vol}(\text{Im } r_m^{(n)}) \sim \mathbb{Q}^* \cdot \lim_{s \rightarrow 1-m} (s-1+m)^{-d_m} \zeta_F(s)$.

Here $a \sim \mathbb{Q}^*b$ means that $a = \kappa b$ for some $\kappa \in \mathbb{Q}^*$.

Remark 2.4 The functional equation for $\zeta_F(s)$ shows that

$$\zeta_F(m) \sim \mathbb{Q}^* \cdot \pi^{(r_1+2r_2-d_m) \cdot m} \cdot |d_F|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot R_m$$

where d_F is the discriminant of F .

3. Zagier's conjecture. According to conjecture 2.1 we have an isomorphism

$$H^1(\Gamma(\mathbb{C}, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong \text{Ker}(\mathcal{B}_n(\mathbb{C})_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(\mathbb{C})_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^*) \cong \text{gr}_{\gamma}^n K_{2n-1}(\mathbb{C})_{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

Recall that there is a homomorphism $\mathcal{L}_n : \mathcal{B}_n(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow R$. We expect that the restriction of this homomorphism to the subgroup $H^1(\Gamma(\mathbb{C}, (n)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \subset \mathcal{B}_n(\mathbb{C})_{\mathbb{Q}}$ coincides with the Borel regulator (the reasons can be found in §1 of [G2]). So applying the Borel theorem we come to the following conjecture.

Conjecture 2.5 *Let F be a number field and σ_j the set of all possible embeddings $F \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(1 \leq j \leq r_1 + 2r_2)$ numbered so that $\sigma_{r_1+k} = \overline{\sigma_{r_1+r_2+k}}$. Then there exists elements*

$$y_1, \dots, y_{d_n} \in \text{Ker}(\mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_{n-1}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*)$$

such that

$$\zeta_F(n) = \pi^{(r_1+2r_2-d_n) \cdot n} |d_F|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \det|\mathcal{L}_n(\sigma_j(y_i))|, \quad (1 \leq i, j \leq d_n).$$

This conjecture was stated by Don Zagier, who proved it for $n = 2$ [Z2] and using a computer gave an impressive list of numerical examples (see [Z1]). The case $n = 2$ follows also from the Borel theorem and the results of S. Bloch [B1] and A. Suslin [S1]. A complete proof for the case $n = 3$ will be given in §3 (see also [G1] and [G2]).

4. A topological consequence of conjecture 1.9. We will show that in the Beilinson's World (*a world where his conjectures are theorems*) conjecture 1.9 implies that commutant of the maximal Tate quotient of the pronilpotent completion of the classical fundamental group of the generic point of an arbitrary complex variety over \mathbb{C} should be free graded pro-Lie algebra.

Recall that A.A. Beilinson conjectured ([B1]) that for arbitrary scheme X there exists a mixed Tate category $\mathcal{M}_T(X)$ of mixed motivic Tate sheaves over X . In the special case $X = \text{Spec } F$, F is a field, $\mathcal{M}_T(\text{Spec } F)$ is just the category $\mathcal{M}_T(F)$ discussed in s. 1–2 of §1. Let us denote by $L(X)_\bullet$ the corresponding mixed Tate Lie algebra. Any morphism of schemes $f : X \rightarrow Y$ defines a Tate functor $f^* : \mathcal{M}_T(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T(X)$ (“inverse image” of mixed Tate sheaves) such that $\omega_{\mathcal{M}_T(X)} f^* = \omega_{\mathcal{M}_T(Y)}$ ($\omega_{\mathcal{M}}$ is the canonical fiber functor for a mixed Tate category \mathcal{M}). So we have a morphism $f_* : L(X)_\bullet \rightarrow L(Y)_\bullet$ of the corresponding mixed Tate Lie algebras. In particular, if X is a scheme over field F , we have the map $p_* : L(X)_\bullet \rightarrow L(\text{Spec } F)_\bullet$ that should be surjective because p^* is fully faithful. Put $L(X)_\bullet^g := \text{Ker } p_*$ (the “geometric part of $L(X)_\bullet$ ”). We get the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L(X)_\bullet^g \rightarrow L(X)_\bullet \xrightarrow{p_*} L(\text{Spec } F)_\bullet \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that

$$[L(X)_\bullet^g, L(X)_\bullet^g] \subset L(X)_{\leq -2}^g.$$

(It was proved in [B2] (see lemma 1.2.1) that $L(X)_\bullet^g$ is generated by $L(X)_{-1}^g$, so $[L(X)_\bullet^g, L(X)_\bullet^g] = L(X)_{\leq -2}^g$, but we will not use this fact).

Let $\eta = \text{Spec } F(X)$ be the generic point of X . Then according to conjecture 1.9 the (graded) Lie algebra $L(\eta)_{\leq -2}$ is free. Therefore its subalgebra $[L(\eta)_\bullet^g, L(\eta)_\bullet^g]$ is also free.

Now let X be a smooth algebraic variety over \mathbb{C} . I need to explain what is the *maximal Tate quotient of the pronilpotent completion of $\pi_1(\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}(X))$* . In [H-Z] R. Hain and S. Zucker defined category $\mathcal{H}_X^{\text{un}}$ of good unipotent variations of mixed \mathbb{R} -Hodge structures over X (“good” means some growth conditions at infinity).

Fix any $x \in X$. Let $V \in \text{Ob } \mathcal{H}_X^{\text{un}}$ and V_x be the fiber of the local system underlying V at point x . Then the monodromy representation $\rho : \pi_1(X, x) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V_x)$ is unipotent and hence defines an algebra homomorphism $\bar{\rho} : \mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge \rightarrow \text{Aut}(V_x)$, where $\mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge := \varprojlim \mathbb{C}[\pi_1(X, x)]/J^r$, (J is the kernel of the usual augmentation homomorphism). It is well-known that $\mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge$ is a Hopf algebra in the category \mathcal{H} of mixed \mathbb{R} -Hodge structures and $\bar{\rho}$ is a mixed Hodge theoretic representation (i.e. representation in the category \mathcal{H}). R. Hain and S. Zucker proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6 *The monodromy representation functor $V \in \mathcal{H}_X^{\text{un}} \mapsto V_x$ defines an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{H}_X^{\text{un}} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{category of mixed Hodge theoretic} \\ \text{representations of } \mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge \end{array} \right\}$$

The vector space underlying a Hodge structure $H \in \mathcal{H}$ is a fiber functor on the category \mathcal{H} . Composition of the functor $s_x : \mathcal{H}_X^{un} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, $s_x : V \mapsto V_x$ with this fiber functor gives a fiber functor on \mathcal{H}_X^{un} . Let us denote by $L(\mathcal{H})$ and $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)$ the corresponding fundamental Lie algebras. We get an imbedding $s_x : L(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)$. There is a canonical functor $c : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X^{un}$, $c(H)$ is a constant variation of the mixed Hodge structure H over X . So we get an epimorphism $c : L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H})$. It is clear that $c \circ s_x = \text{id}$. Set $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g := \text{Ker } c$. We get the following split exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x) \xrightarrow[\begin{smallmatrix} \hat{s}_x \\ c \end{smallmatrix}]{\hat{s}_x} L(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow 0$$

Note that $s_x(L(\mathcal{H}))$ acts on the ideal $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$, and hence $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$ is equipped with canonical mixed Hodge structure. Further an $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)$ -module is just a mixed Hodge theoretic representation of $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$.

We have $\mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge = \mathbb{C} \oplus \hat{J}$. The set of primitive elements

$$\mathfrak{G}_x := \{v \in \hat{J} : \Delta(v) = v \hat{\otimes} 1 + 1 \hat{\otimes} v\}$$

is a Lie algebra (Δ is the coproduct). The forgetting functor $\mathcal{H}_X^{un} \rightarrow \{\text{local systems on } X\}$ provides a homomorphism of Lie algebras $f_x : \mathfrak{G}_x \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)$ such that $c \circ f_x = 0$. So $f_x : \mathfrak{G}_x \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$. Mixed Hodge structures \mathfrak{G}_x form a good variation of mixed Hodge structures over X . So f_x is a morphism of mixed Hodge structures. Now it follows from theorem 2.6 that $f_x : \mathfrak{G}_x \xrightarrow{\sim} L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$ is an isomorphism.

Let $\mathcal{H}_X^T \subset \mathcal{H}_X^{un}$ be a subcategory of variations of mixed Hodge-Tate structures (i.e. $gr_{2n-1}^W V_x = 0$, $gr_{2n}^W V_x$ is a Hodge structure of type (n, n)). Then $L(\mathcal{H}_X^T, x)^g$ is maximal Tate quotient of $L(\mathcal{H}_X^{un}, x)^g$. If $\mathfrak{G}_x^T(X)$ is maximal Tate quotient of \mathfrak{G}_x , $\mathfrak{G}_x^T(X) \xrightarrow{\sim} L(\mathcal{H}_X^T, x)^g$ is an isomorphism. There is another fiber functor on category \mathcal{H}_X^T that does not involve choice of $x \in X$: $H \in \mathcal{H}_X^T \mapsto \oplus_n gr_{2n}^W H$. Let us denote the corresponding geometric Lie algebra $L(\mathcal{H}_X^T)^g$. Of course, $L(\mathcal{H}_X^T)^g \cong \mathfrak{G}_x^T(X)$. Set

$$L(\mathcal{H}_\eta^T)^g := \lim_{U \subset X} L(\mathcal{H}_U^T)^g.$$

This is the **definition** of maximal Tate quotient of pronilpotent completion of fundamental group of generic point of a complex algebraic variety.

Conjecture 2.7 *The commutant of the Lie algebra $L(\mathcal{H}_\eta^T)^g$ is free.*

The Hodge-realization functor $\mathcal{M}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X^T$ induces morphism $L(\mathcal{H}_X^T) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{M}_T(X))$ that should be isomorphism. (This follows from Beilinson's definition of mixed Hodge structure on $\mathbb{C}\pi_1(X, x)^\wedge$ and standard conjectures including the Hodge one - see [B2] and [B-D]). Therefore conjecture 2.7 is a corollary of conjecture 1.9 in the Beilinson's World.

It is interesting to compare conjecture 2.7 with the following one stated by F.A. Bogomolov.

Conjecture 2.8. Let $\text{Gal } K$ be the maximal pro- p -quotient of the Galois group of the field K containing a nontrivial algebraically closed subfield. Then commutant $[\text{Gal } K, \text{Gal } K]$ is free as a pro- p -group.

It is also reminiscent of the following Shafarevich's conjecture

Conjecture 2.9 $[\text{Gal } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}, \text{Gal } \bar{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}]$ is free as a profinite group.

3. A PROOF OF ZAGIER'S CONJECTURE ABOUT $\zeta_F(3)$

1. The Grassmanian complex ([S1], see also [BMS]). We will say that an m -tuple of vectors in n -dimensional vector space V^n is in a generic position if any $k \leq n$ vectors are linearly independent. **Configurations** of m vectors in V^n are n -tuples of vectors considered modulo $GL(V^n)$ -equivalence. Let us denote by $\tilde{C}_m(n)$ the free abelian group generated by m -tuples of vectors in V^n in generic position. Let $C_m(n) := \tilde{C}_m(n)_{GL(V^n)}$ be the group of coinvariants of the natural action of $GL(V^n)$ on $\tilde{C}_m(n)$. Then $C_m(n)$ is a free abelian group generated by configurations of m vectors in generic position in V^n . There is a differential

$$d: \tilde{C}_m(n) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_{m-1}(n); \quad d: (l_1, \dots, l_m) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^{i-1} (l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_m).$$

We get a complex $(\tilde{C}_*(n), d)$ where $\tilde{C}_m(n)$ placed in degree $m - 1$.

Lemma 3.1 $H_i(\tilde{C}_*(n)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \geq 1 \\ \mathbb{Z} & \text{for } i = 0 \end{cases}$ if F is an infinite field.

Proof. If $d(\Sigma n_j(l_1^{(j)}, \dots, l_m^{(j)})) = 0$ choose a vector v in a generic position with respect to all $l_k^{(j)}$. Then $d(\Sigma n_j(v, l_1^{(j)}, \dots, l_m^{(j)})) = \Sigma n_j(l_1^{(j)}, \dots, l_m^{(j)}) \square$

So $\tilde{C}_*(n)$ is a resolution of \mathbb{Z} , and therefore we have a map

$$H_i(GL_n(F)) \longrightarrow H_i(C_*(n)). \quad (1)$$

2. Our strategy. We will work modulo 6-torsion. In the next section we will construct a homomorphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} C_7(3) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_6(3) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_5(3) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_4(3) \\ & & \downarrow f_6(3) & & \downarrow f_5(3) & & \downarrow f_4(3) \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_3(F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes F^* & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \wedge^3 F^* \end{array} \quad (3.2)$$

and hence get a map

$$c_i(3) : H_i(GL_3(F)) \rightarrow H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F, 3)), \quad i = 3, 4, 5.$$

Then we will construct a map $c_i(N) : H_i(GL_N(F)) \rightarrow H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F, 3))$ such that the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_i(GL_3(F)) & \xrightarrow{c_i(3)} & H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F, 3)) \\ & \searrow & \nearrow c_i(N) \\ & & H_i(GL_N(F)) \end{array}$$

and $\text{Im } c_i(N) = \text{Im } c_i(3)$.

Recall that $H_n(GL_n(F)) = H_n(GL(F))$ (see [S1]), so

$$K_n(F)_\mathbb{Q} = \text{Prim } H_n(GL(F), \mathbb{Q}) = \text{Prim } H_n(GL_n(F), \mathbb{Q}).$$

Put

$$K_n^{(j)}(F)_\mathbb{Q} := \text{Im}(H_n(GL_{n-j}(F), \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow H_n(GL_n(F), \mathbb{Q})) \cap \text{Prim } H_n(GL_n(F), \mathbb{Q}).$$

$$K_n^{[j]}(F)_\mathbb{Q} := K_n^{(j)}(F)_\mathbb{Q} / K_n^{(j+1)}(F)_\mathbb{Q}.$$

Conjecture 3.2 (A.A. Suslin, unpublished) $K_n^{[j]}(F)_\mathbb{Q} \cong gr_\gamma^{n-j} K_n(F)_\mathbb{Q}$.

(J. Yang [Y1] proved this conjecture for number fields with the only one exception: $F = \mathbb{Q}$. Another proof for all number fields in the case $n = 5$ follows from results of this paper). We show that $c_i(3)$ vanishes on the image of $H_i(GL_2(F), \mathbb{Q})$, hence we get canonical homomorphisms

$$C_i^{[i-3]} : K_i^{[i-3]}(F)_\mathbb{Q} \longrightarrow H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F, 3) \otimes \mathbb{Q}) \quad (i = 3, 4, 5).$$

A.A. Suslin proved that $K_n^{[0]}(F)_\mathbb{Q} \cong K_n^M(F)_\mathbb{Q}$. So $C_3^{[0]}$ is an isomorphism. $C_4^{[1]}$ and $C_5^{[2]}$ also should be isomorphisms. In any case $C_5^{[2]} : K_5^{[2]}(F) \rightarrow H^1(\Gamma(F, 3) \otimes \mathbb{Q})$. We will construct a homomorphism $c_5 : K_5(F) \rightarrow H^1(\Gamma(F, 3) \otimes \mathbb{Q})$ and show that the composition

$$K_5(\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{c_5} H^1(\Gamma(\mathbb{C}, 3) \otimes \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{L}_3} R$$

coincides with Borel regulator [Bo2]. This implies immediately Zagier's conjecture about $\zeta_F(3)$.

3. Construction of homomorphism of complexes 3.2. Choose a volume form $\omega \in \wedge^3(V^3)^*$. Set $\Delta(l_i, l_j, l_k) := \langle \omega, l_i \wedge l_j \wedge l_k \rangle \in F^*$. Put

$$f_4(3) : (l_1, \dots, l_4) \mapsto \text{Alt } \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_3, l_4). \quad (3)$$


Here

$$\text{Alt } f(l_1, \dots, l_n) := \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} (-1)^{|\sigma|} f(l_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, l_{\sigma(n)}).$$

Lemma 3.3 $f_4(3)$ does not depend on the choice of ω .

Proof. Let $\omega' = \lambda\omega$, $\lambda \in F^*$. Then the difference between the right-hand sides of (3.3) computed using ω' and ω is $\text{Alt}(\lambda \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_3, l_4))$. But this is 0 because we alternate an expression that is symmetric with respect to permutation of 1 and 4 \square .

For a non-zero vector $l \in V^3$ let us denote by \bar{l} the corresponding point in $P(V^3) = P^2$. Let us denote by $(\bar{l}_1 | \bar{l}_2, \dots, \bar{l}_4)$ the configuration of 4 points on P^1 obtained by projection of points l_2, \dots, l_5 with the center at point l_1 , see fig. 3.1 (All lines passing through l_1 form a projective line; any point $m \neq l_1$ defines a point on this line).



(fig. 3.1)

Now let $(m_1, \dots, m_4) \in C_4(2)$. Let us define the cross-ratio as $r(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_4)$ as follows

$$r(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \bar{m}_4) := \frac{\Delta(m_1, m_3)\Delta(m_2, m_4)}{\Delta(m_1, m_4)\Delta(m_2, m_3)}. \quad (4)$$

It is clear that the right-hand side of (3.4) does not depend on length of m_i . We have

$$\begin{aligned} r(\bar{m}_1, \bar{m}_2, \bar{m}_3, \bar{m}_4) &= r(\bar{m}_2, \bar{m}_1, \bar{m}_3, \bar{m}_4)^{-1} = r(\bar{m}_1, \bar{m}_2, \bar{m}_4, \bar{m}_3)^{-1} = \\ &= 1 - r(\bar{m}_1, \bar{m}_3, \bar{m}_2, \bar{m}_4). \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The last equality is proved using the identity

$$\Delta(m_1, m_4)\Delta(m_2, m_3) - \Delta(m_1, m_2)\Delta(m_3, m_4) = \Delta(m_1, m_3)\Delta(m_2, m_4).$$

Set

$$f_5(3)(l_1, \dots, l_5) := \frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}(\{r(\bar{l}_1|\bar{l}_2, \dots, \bar{l}_5)\}_2 \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3)). \quad (6)$$

Here $\{x\}_2$ means the image of $\{x\}$ in $\mathcal{B}_2(F)$.

Proposition 3.4 $f_5(3)$ does not depend on ω .

Proof. The difference between the right-hand sides of (3.6) computed using $\lambda \cdot \omega$ and ω is proportional to

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 (-1)^i \{r(\bar{l}_i|\bar{l}_1, \dots, \hat{\bar{l}}_i, \dots, \bar{l}_5)\}_2 \otimes \lambda$$

because $\{r(m_1, \dots, m_4)\}_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is sqew-symmetric with respect to permutation of points m_i – see (3.5) and example 1 in s.4 of §1. So we need to prove the following

Lemma 3.5 Let x_1, \dots, x_5 be 5 points on P^2 in generic position. Then


$$\sum_{i=1}^5 (-1)^i \{r(x_i|x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_5)\} \in \mathcal{R}_2(F).$$

This lemma follows from

Lemma 3.6 Let m_1, \dots, m_5 be 5 different points on P^1 . Then

$$R_2(m_1, \dots, m_5) := \sum_{i=1}^5 (-1)^i \{r(m_1, \dots, \hat{m}_i, \dots, m_5)\} \in \mathcal{R}_2(F). \quad (7)$$

Indeed, let us consider the unique conic (a curve of order 2) passing through points x_1, \dots, x_5 as a projective line. It remains to apply lemma 3.6 to these points on this projective line (see fig. 3.2)



Proof of lemma 3.6. Consider the following homomorphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 C_5(2) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_4(2) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_3(2) \\
 & & \downarrow f_4(2) & & \downarrow f_3(2) \\
 & & \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & \wedge^2 F^* \\
 & & & & \\
 & & f_3(2) : (l_1, l_2, l_3) \mapsto \Delta(l_1, l_2) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_3) - \Delta(l_2, l_1) \wedge \Delta(l_2, l_3) + \\
 & & \quad + \Delta(l_3, l_1) \wedge \Delta(l_3, l_2) \\
 & & f_4(2) : (l_1, \dots, l_4) \mapsto \{r(\bar{l}_1, \dots, \bar{l}_4)\} .
 \end{array} \tag{3.8}$$

Direct calculation using (3.4) – (3.5) shows that (3.8) is commutative. So

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^5 (-1)^i \{r(\bar{m}_1, \dots, \hat{m}_i, \dots, \bar{m}_5)\} \right) &\equiv \delta_2 \circ f_4(2) \circ d = \\
 &= f_3(2) \circ d^2 = 0 .
 \end{aligned}$$

Now it is easy to complete the proof of lemma 3.6 using specialization \square .

Proposition 3.7 $f_4(3) \circ d = d \circ f_5(3)$

Proof. Direct calculation using (3.4) \square


Now put

$$f_6(3) : (l_1, \dots, l_6) \mapsto \text{Alt} \left\{ \frac{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4) \Delta(l_2, l_3, l_5) \Delta(l_3, l_1, l_6)}{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_5) \Delta(l_2, l_3, l_6) \Delta(l_3, l_1, l_4)} \right\} \tag{9}$$

4. A geometric definition of the generalized cross-ratio (3.9). Let $(a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3)$ be a configuration of 6 distinct points in P^2 such that a_1, a_2, a_3 do not lie on a line and $b_i \in \overline{a_i a_{i+1}}$ (see fig. 3.3). Let $P^2 = P(V_3)$. Choose vectors in V_3 such that they are projected to points a_i, b_i . By an abuse of notations we will denote them by the same letters. Choose $f_i \in V_3^*$ such that $f_i(a_i) = f_i(a_{i+1}) = 0$. Put

$$r'_3(a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3) = \frac{f_1(b_2) \cdot f_2(b_3) \cdot f_3(b_1)}{f_1(b_3) \cdot f_2(b_1) \cdot f_3(b_2)} . \tag{10}$$

The right-hand side of (3.10) does not depend on the choice of vectors f_i, b_j .



(fig. 3.3)

Lemma 3.8 $r(b_1|a_2, a_3, b_2, b_3) = r'_3(a_1, a_2, a_3, b_1, b_2, b_3)$.


Proof. Put

$$f_1(v) := \Delta(b_1, a_2, v); f_2(v) := \Delta(b_2, a_3, v); f_3(v) := \Delta(b_3, a_3, v) .$$

Then the right-hand side of (3.10) is equal to

$$\frac{\Delta(b_1, a_2, b_2) \cdot \Delta(b_2, a_3, b_3) \cdot \Delta(b_3, a_3, b_1)}{\Delta(b_1, a_2, b_3) \cdot \Delta(b_2, a_3, b_1) \cdot \Delta(b_3, a_3, b_2)} = \frac{\Delta(b_1, a_2, b_2) \cdot \Delta(b_1, a_3, b_3)}{\Delta(b_1, a_2, b_3) \cdot \Delta(b_1, a_3, b_2)} = r(b_1|a_2, a_3, b_2, b_3) \quad \square$$

Now let (l_1, \dots, l_6) be a configuration of 6 distinct points in P^2 in generic position. Put $a_i := \overline{l_i l_{i+3}} \cap \overline{l_{i-1} l_{i+2}}$, ($1 \leq i \leq 3$, indices modulo 6; see fig. 3.4).



(fig. 3.4)

Then $l_i \in \overline{a_i a_{i+1}}$, so $(a_1, a_2, a_3, l_1, l_2, l_3)$ is a configuration of considered above type. Let us define the generalized cross-ratio $r_3 : C_6(3) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\}]$ as follows:

$$r_3(l_1, \dots, l_6) := \text{Alt} \{r'_3(a_1, a_2, a_3, l_1, l_2, l_3)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\}]. \quad (11)$$

More precisely, the alternation here means the following. Let $s \in S_6$ be a permutation and

$$a_i^{(s)} := \overline{l_{s(i)} l_{s(i+3)}} \cap \overline{l_{s(i-1)} l_{s(i+2)}}, \quad (1 \leq i \leq 3).$$

Then

$$r_3(l_1, \dots, l_6) := \sum_{s \in S_6} (-1)^{|\sigma(s)|} \{r'_3(a_1^{(s)}, a_2^{(s)}, a_3^{(s)}, l_{s(1)}, l_{s(2)}, l_{s(3)})\}. \quad (12)$$

Lemma 3.9 $r_3(l_1, \dots, l_6) = f_6(3)(l_1, \dots, l_6)$

Proof. It is sufficient to prove that

$$r'_3(a_1, a_2, a_3, l_1, l_2, l_3) = \frac{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4) \Delta(l_2, l_3, l_5) \Delta(l_3, l_1, l_6)}{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_5) \Delta(l_2, l_3, l_6) \Delta(l_3, l_1, l_4)}.$$

But this follows immediately from the definition (3.10) if we put $f_i(v) := \Delta(l_i, l_{i+3}, v)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. \square

In the previous version of the proof of Zagier's conjecture about $\zeta_F(3)$ I used the same formulas for homomorphism $f_4(3)$ and $f_5(3)$, but a little bit different one for $f_6(3)$ that was not skew-symmetric. Formula 3.9 was discovered by D.Zagier by the skew-symmetrisation of that formula and also by the author.

5. Theorem 3.10 $f_5(3) \circ d = \delta \circ f_6(3)$.

Proof. Computing $\delta \circ f_6(3)$ using formula (3.9) and lemma (3.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \circ f_6(3)(l_1, \dots, l_6) &= \text{Alt}(\{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_4, a_3)\}_2 \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4)) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}([\{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_4, a_3)\}_2 - \{r(l_1|l_2, l_6, l_4, a_3)\}_2] \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4)). \end{aligned}$$

Here $a_3 = \overline{l_2 l_5} \cap \overline{l_3 l_6}$ and we understand alternation in the same way as in formula (3.11).

The 5-term relation for the configuration $(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_6, l_4, a_3)$ gives us

$$\delta \circ f_6(3)(l_1, \dots, l_6) = \frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}[-\{r(l_1|l_3, l_6, l_4, a_3)\}_2 + \{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_6, a_3)\}_2 - \{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_6, l_4)\}_2] \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4) \quad (13)$$

Considering the projection onto the line $\overline{l_3 l_6}$ we see that (see fig. 3.4)

$$\begin{aligned} (l_1|l_3, l_6, l_4, a_3) &\equiv (l_4|l_3, l_6, l_1, a_3) \\ (l_1|l_2, l_3, l_6, a_3) &\equiv (l_2|l_1, l_3, l_6, a_3). \end{aligned}$$

So the first 2 terms in the first factor in (3.13) disappear after alternation and we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \circ f_6(3)(l_1, \dots, l_6) &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}(\{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_6, l_4)\}_2 \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4)) = \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}(\{r(l_1|l_2, l_3, l_4, l_5)\}_2 \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3)). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

But this coincides with $f_5(3) \circ d(l_1, \dots, l_6)$ computed using formula (3.5) \square

6. The “7-term” functional equation for the trilogarithm.

Theorem 3.11 $f_6(3) \circ d = 0$. Over \mathbb{C}

$$\sum_{i=1}^7 (-1)^{i-1} \mathcal{L}_3(r_3(l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_7)) = 0. \quad (15)$$


Proof. a) According to theorem 1.10 one has

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \circ f_6(3) \circ d &= f_5(3) \circ d \circ d = 0, \quad \text{i.e. (because } r_3 = f_6(3)) \\ \delta \circ \left(\sum_{i=1}^7 (-1)^{i-1} r_3(l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_7) \right) &= 0 \quad \text{in } \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes F^*. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to deform a generic configuration of 7 vectors to such a special one that clearly satisfies the condition a) of the theorem. This can be done, for example, using an a specialisation $a = b = 1, c = 0$ of explicit formula (3.17) below for the “7-term” relation corresponding to a configuration represented on fig. 3.5. Applying theorem 1.15 in the case $n = 3$ we get 3.15.

Remark. The “7-term” functional equation has 840 summands. In order to get a shorter version we need to use a degenerate configurations (l_1, \dots, l_7) . For example, let homogeneous coordinates of points l_i be represented by columns of the following matrix (see also fig. 3.5)

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & c \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & a & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & b & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$



(fig. 3.5)

Put

$$\begin{aligned}
R_3(a, b, c) := & \oplus_{\text{cycle}} \left(\{ca - a + 1\} + \left\{ \frac{ca - a + 1}{ca} \right\} + \{c\} + \left\{ \frac{(bc - c + 1)}{(ca - a + 1)b} \right\} - \right. \\
& \left. \left\{ \frac{ca - a + 1}{c} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{(bc - c + 1)a}{(ca - a + 1)} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{(bc - c + 1)}{(ca - a + 1)bc} \right\} - \{1\} \right) \\
& + \{-abc\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Here $\oplus_{\text{cycle}} f(a, b, c) := f(a, b, c) + f(c, a, b) + f(b, c, a)$. The functional equation (3.15) for this special configuration (3.16) has form

$$\mathcal{L}_3(R_3(a, b, c)) = 0.$$

7. The Grassmanian bicomplex. This is the following bicomplex

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\longrightarrow & C_{n+5}(n_2) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+4}(n+2) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+3}(n+2) & \\
& & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' \\
\longrightarrow & C_{n+4}(n+1) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+3}(n+1) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+2}(n+1) & \\
& & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' \\
\longrightarrow & C_{n+3}(n) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+2}(n) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_{n+1}(n) & \\
& & & & & &
\end{array} \tag{18}$$

where

$$d' : (l_1, \dots, l_m) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^m (-1)^{i-1} (l_i | l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_m).$$

Denote by $(T_*(n), \partial)$ the total complex associated with this bicomplex; $T_{n+1}(n) := C_{n+1}(n)$. Let us define a homomorphism $\psi_*(3)$

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\longrightarrow & T_6(3) & \longrightarrow & T_5(3) & \longrightarrow & T_4(3) \\
& \downarrow \psi_6(3) & & \downarrow \psi_5(3) & & \downarrow \psi_4(3) \\
& \mathcal{B}_3(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes F^* & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^3 F^*
\end{array} \tag{3.19}$$

as follows. It coincides with homomorphism (3.2) on the subcomplex $C_*(3) \hookrightarrow T_*(3)$ and is zero on all other groups $C_*(3+i)$.

Theorem 3.12. *This is a correct definition, i.e.*

$$\psi_{3+i}(3) \circ d' = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof.

a) $i = 1$. It is easy to see that

$$\psi_4(3) \circ d' : (l_1, \dots, l_5) \mapsto \text{Alt}\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3, l_5) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4, l_5).$$

The right-hand side is zero because we alternate an expression that is symmetric with respect to permutation of l_1 and l_2 .

b) $i = 2$. The

$$\psi_5(3) \circ d' : (l_1, \dots, l_6) \mapsto \frac{1}{2} \text{Alt}(\{r(l_1, l_2|l_3, l_4, l_5, l_6)\} \otimes \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4)) .$$

This is zero for the same reason as above.

c) $i = 3$. We have to prove the following

$$\psi_6(3) \left(\sum_{i=1}^7 (-1)^i (l_i | l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_7) \right) = 0 . \quad (20)$$

This will be done in sections 8–9.

8. The duality of configurations (see §7 of [G2]). Let us denote by $\text{Conf}_p(q)$ the set of all configurations of p vectors in a q -dimensional vector space V_q in generic position. There is a duality

$$* : \text{Conf}_{m+n}(m) \rightarrow \text{Conf}_{m+n}(n); \quad *^2 = \text{id}$$

that satisfies the following important properties:

- (1) $*$ commutes with the action of the permutation group S_{m+n} on vectors of a configuration.
- (2) If $*(l_1, \dots, l_{m+n}) = (l'_1, \dots, l'_{m+n})$, then

$$*(l_1, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_{m+n}) = (l'_i | l'_1, \dots, \hat{l}'_i, \dots, l'_{m+n})$$

i.e. the forgetting of the i -th vector of a configuration is dual to the projection along the i -th vector.

- (3) Let us choose volume forms in V^m and V^n ; consider a partition

$$\{1, \dots, m+n\} = \{i_1 < \dots < i_m\} \cup \{j_1 < \dots < j_n\} .$$

Then $\frac{\Delta(l_{i_1}, \dots, l_{i_m})}{\Delta(l'_{j_1}, \dots, l'_{j_n})}$ does not depend on a partition.

Three definitions of $*$: the Grassmanian, the coordinate, and the geometric one, were suggested in §7 of [G2]. We need only the first two.

- i) **The Grassmanian definition.** Let (l_1, \dots, l_{m+n}) be a coordinate frame in a vector space V . Let us denote by $\hat{G}_m(V, \{l_i\})$ the set of all m -dimensional subspaces V that are in generic position to coordinate hyperplanes. R. MacPherson constructed in [Mac] an isomorphism $p : \hat{G}_m(V, \{l_i\}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Conf}_{m+n}(n)$. Namely, $p(h)$ is a configuration formed by images of l_i in V/h . Let (f^1, \dots, f^{m+n}) be the dual basis in V^* and $h^\perp : \{f \in V^* | \langle f, v \rangle = 0 \text{ for any } v \in h\}$. Then the definition of $*$ is given by the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\hat{G}_m(V, \{l_i\}) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\perp} & \hat{G}_n(V^*, \{f^j\}) \\
\downarrow p \wr & & \downarrow \wr p \\
\text{Conf}_{m+n}(n) & \xrightarrow{*} & \text{Conf}_{m+n}(m)
\end{array}$$

- ii) **The coordinate definition.** A configuration of $(m+n)$ vectors in an m -dimensional coordinate space can be represented as columns of the following $m \times (m+n)$ -matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1n} \\ 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 & a_{m1} & \dots & a_{mn} \end{pmatrix} = (I_m, A).$$

Then the dual configuration is represented by the $n \times (m+n)$ -matrix $(-A^t, I_n)$. These definitions give the same duality. Indeed, the subspace h is generated by $l_{m+i} - \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij} e_j$ and the subspace h^\perp by $f^j + \sum_{i=1}^n a_{ij} f_{m+i}$.

Now properties 1), 2) follow immediately from the first definition, and 3) is easy to see from the second one.

9. The end of the proof of theorem 3.12c).

Proposition 3.13 $\psi_6(3)((l_1, \dots, l_6) + *(l_1, \dots, l_6)) = 0$.

Proof. If $*(l_1, \dots, l_6) = (l'_1, \dots, l'_6)$ then according to the property 3) of $*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4)\Delta(l_2, l_3, l_5)\Delta(l_3, l_1, l_6)}{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_5)\Delta(l_2, l_3, l_6)\Delta(l_3, l_1, l_4)} &= \frac{\Delta(l'_5, l'_6, l'_3)\Delta(l'_4, l'_6, l'_1)\Delta(l'_4, l'_5, l'_2)}{\Delta(l'_4, l'_6, l'_3)\Delta(l'_4, l'_5, l'_1)\Delta(l'_5, l'_6, l'_2)} \equiv \\
&\equiv \frac{\Delta(l'_4, l'_5, l'_2)\Delta(l'_5, l'_6, l'_3)\Delta(l'_6, l'_4, l'_1)}{\Delta(l'_4, l'_5, l'_1)\Delta(l'_5, l'_6, l'_2)\Delta(l'_6, l'_4, l'_3)}.
\end{aligned}$$

But $\{x\} = \{x^{-1}\} \bmod \mathcal{R}_3(F)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) \mapsto (4, 5, 6, 1, 2, 3)$ is an odd permutation, so proposition 3.13 is proved. \square

Formula (3.20) and hence theorem 3.12 c) follows immediately from proposition 3.13 and property 2) of $*$ \square

10. The bicomplex $C_*^m(n)$. Let us define a differential $d^{(k)} : \tilde{C}_p(n) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_{p-1}(n)$ as follows: $d^{(k)} : (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{p-k} (-1)^{i-1} (\ell_1, \dots, \hat{\ell}_{k+i}, \dots, \ell_p)$. Note that $d^{(0)} \equiv d$ – see s.1.

Lemma 3.14 *The following complex is acyclic ($k > 0$):*

$$\dots \longrightarrow \tilde{C}_{k+2}(n) \xrightarrow{d^{(k)}} \tilde{C}_{k+1}(n) \xrightarrow{d^{(k)}} \tilde{C}_k(n).$$

The proof is in complete analogy with the one of Lemma 3.1.

Let $\text{Sym}_k : \tilde{C}_p(n) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_p(n)$ be the symmetrisation of the first k vectors:

$$\text{Sym}_k : (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) \mapsto \sum_{\sigma \in S_k} \frac{1}{k!} (l_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, l_{\sigma(k)}, l_{k+1}, \dots, l_p).$$

Define a homomorphism $\lambda^{(k)} : \tilde{C}_p(n) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_p(n)$ as follows:

$$\lambda^{(k)} : (\ell_1, \dots, \ell_p) \mapsto \sum_{i > k} (-1)^{i+k-1} \text{Sym}_{k+1}(l_1, \dots, l_k, l_i, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_p).$$

Lemma 3.15 $d^{(k+1)} \circ \lambda^{(k)} = -\lambda^{(k)} \circ d^{(k)}$.

Proof. This is obvious for the homomorphism $\tilde{\lambda}^{(k)}$ defined by the same formula as $\lambda^{(k)}$, but without symmetrisation. It remains to symmetrise the first $k+1$ vectors. \square

Lemma 3.16 $\lambda^{(k+1)} \circ \lambda^{(k)} = 0$.

Proof. Straightforward. (Note that $\tilde{\lambda}^{(k+1)} \circ \tilde{\lambda}^{(k)} \neq 0$.) \square

Therefore we get the following bicomplex $\tilde{C}_*^m(n)$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \dots & \xrightarrow{d} & \tilde{C}_3(n) & \xrightarrow{d} & \tilde{C}_2(n) & \xrightarrow{d} & \tilde{C}_1(n) \\ & & \downarrow \lambda^{(0)} & & \downarrow \lambda^{(0)} & & \downarrow \lambda^{(0)} \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{d^{(1)}} & \tilde{C}_3(n) & \xrightarrow{d^{(1)}} & \tilde{C}_2(n) & \xrightarrow{d^{(1)}} & \tilde{C}_1(n) \\ & & \downarrow \lambda^{(1)} & & \downarrow \lambda^{(1)} & & \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{d^{(2)}} & \tilde{C}_3(n) & \xrightarrow{d^{(2)}} & \tilde{C}_2(n) & & \\ & & \downarrow \lambda^{(2)} & & & & \\ \dots & \xrightarrow{d^{(3)}} & \tilde{C}_3(n) & & & & \\ & & \vdots & & & & \\ \dots & \longrightarrow & \tilde{C}_{m-1}(n) & & & & \end{array} \quad (21)$$

Remark. The bicomplex $C_*^2(3)$ was considered by A.A. Suslin in §3 of [S3].

Let $(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n), \partial)$ be the simple complex, associated with the bicomplex $\tilde{C}_*^m(n)$. More precisely, $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n)$ is the direct sum of the terms $\tilde{C}_{k+i}(n)$ at level i , for $i = 0, \dots, m-1$ (the top line has level 0, the bottom line level $m-1$) and has degree $k-1$ in the complex $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n)$. It is placed at degrees $-1, 0, +1, \dots$, (∂ has degree -1).

Lemma 3.17 $H^i(\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n)) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z}, & i = 0 \\ 0, & i \neq 0 \end{cases}$.

The proof follows immediately from lemmas 3.14 and 3.15.

The group $GL_n(F)$ acts naturally on the complex $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n)$. Let us denote complex $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_*^m(n)_{GL_n(F)}$ as $\mathcal{D}_*^m(n)$. Lemma 3.17 implies that there is a canonical homomorphism

$$H_*(GL_n(F), \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_*(\mathcal{D}_*^m(n)).$$

Now let us define a homomorphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_6^{(n-2)}(n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_5^{(n-2)}(n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_4^{(n-2)}(n) & \longrightarrow \\
& \downarrow f_3 & & \downarrow f_3 & & \downarrow f_3 & \\
\longrightarrow & T_6(3) & \longrightarrow & T_5(3) & \longrightarrow & T_4(3) & \longrightarrow 0
\end{array} \tag{3.22}$$

More precisely, we will define a homomorphism \tilde{f} of the corresponding bicomplex $C_*^{(n-2)}(n)$ to the Grassmanian bicomplex (see 3.18)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
& & & \longrightarrow & C_7(5) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_6(5) \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' \\
& & C_7(4) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_6(4) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_5(4) \\
& & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' & & \downarrow d' \\
\longrightarrow & C_6(3) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_5(3) & \xrightarrow{d} & C_4(3)
\end{array}$$

Namely, if $(l_1, \dots, l_m) \in C_m(p)$ is placed at the level k in the bicomplex $C_*^{n-2}(n)$, i.e. if we apply to (l_1, \dots, l_m) the horizontal differential $d^{(k)}$ (see (3.21)) then we set

$$\tilde{f} : (l_1, \dots, l_m) \mapsto (l_1, \dots, l_k | l_{k+1}, \dots, l_m) \in C_{m-k}(p-k)$$

Here we use the following notations. Let $(l_1, \dots, l_k, \dots, l_m) \in C_m(V)$. Let us denote by $\langle l_1, \dots, l_n \rangle$ the subspace generated by l_1, \dots, l_k . Then

$$(l_1, \dots, l_k | l_{k+1}, \dots, l_m)$$

is the configuration of $m-k$ vectors in $V/\langle l_1, \dots, l_k \rangle$.

So we get a homomorphism f_3 of the corresponding total complexes (see (3.22)). The composition of this homomorphism with homomorphism ψ constructed above

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\longrightarrow & T_6(3) & \longrightarrow & T_5(3) & \longrightarrow & T_4(3) & \\
& \downarrow \psi_6(3) & & \downarrow \psi_5(3) & & \downarrow \psi_4(3) & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_3(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes F^* & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^3 F^*
\end{array}$$

gives the desired homomorphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_6^{(n-2)}(n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_5^{(n-2)}(n) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_4^{(n-2)}(n) & \\
& \downarrow \psi \circ f & & \downarrow \psi \circ f & & \downarrow \psi \circ f & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_3(F) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes F^* & \longrightarrow & \Lambda^3 F^*
\end{array}$$

Therefore we get the canonical homomorphisms

$$H_i(GL_n(F)) \longrightarrow H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F, 3)). \tag{23}$$

Lemma 3.18 *The restrictions of the homomorphisms (3.23) to the subgroup $H_i(GL_3(F))$ coincide with those in (3.3).*

Proof. Choose $n-3$ linearly independent vectors v_1, \dots, v_{n-3} in an n -dimensional vector space V_n and a 3-dimensional complementary subspace $V_3 : V_n = \langle v_1, \dots, v_{n-3} \rangle \oplus$

V_3 . Then there is a homomorphism of complexes $\xi : C_*(V_3) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_*^{n-2}(V_n)$ where $\xi(C_*(V_3))$ lies in the lowest line of the bicomplex (3.20) and $\xi : (l_1, \dots, l_k) \mapsto (v_1, \dots, v_{n-3}, l_1, \dots, l_k)$.

It is clear from the definition that we get a commutative diagram

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C_*(3) & \xrightarrow{\xi} & \mathcal{D}_*^{(n-2)}(n) \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \psi \circ f \\ & \Gamma(F, 3) & \end{array}$$

□

Finally, the restriction of the homomorphisms

$$c_i(3) : H_i(GL_3(F)) \rightarrow H^{6-i}(\Gamma(F; 3))$$

to the image of the subgroup $H_i(GL_2(F))$ is equal to zero, because the resolution $\tilde{D}_*(3)$ of the trivial $GL_3(F)$ -module \mathbb{Z} has a $GL_2(F)$ -invariant section

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{Z} \\ \downarrow \\ \dots \rightarrow \tilde{C}_2(3) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_1(3) \end{array}$$

Namely, if $V_3 = V_2 \oplus \langle v \rangle$, then the formula $n \mapsto n \cdot (v) \in \tilde{C}_1(3)$ defines a $GL_2(V_2)$ -invariant section $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \tilde{C}_*(V_3)$.

So we have constructed homomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} C_5^{[2]} : K_5^{[2]}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} &\rightarrow H^1(\Gamma(F; 3)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \\ C_4^{[1]} : K_4^{[1]}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} &\rightarrow H^2(\Gamma(F; 3)_{\mathbb{Q}}). \end{aligned}$$

Conjecture 3.19 *Homomorphisms $C_4^{[1]}, C_5^{[2]}$ are isomorphisms.*

11. Explicit formula for a 5-cocycle representing a class of continuous cohomology of $GL_3(\mathbb{C})$. Choose a point $x \in \mathbb{C}P^2$. Then there is a measurable cocycle

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(x)} : \underbrace{GL_3(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times GL_3(\mathbb{C})}_{6 \text{ times}} &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ f^{(x)}(g_1, \dots, g_6) &:= \mathcal{L}_3(r_3(g_1x, \dots, g_6x)) \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where r_3 is the generalized cross-ratio of 6 points in P^2 (see s. 4). It is certainly invariant under the left action of $GL_3(\mathbb{C})$. So the 7-term relation (3.15) for the trilogarithm just means that $f^{(x)}$ is a measurable cocycle of $GL_3(\mathbb{C})$. Different points x gives cohomologous cocycles.

The function $\mathcal{L}_3(z)$ is continuous on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ and hence bounded. So the function $f^{(x)}$ is also bounded. Applying proposition 1.14 from ch. III of [Gu] we see that the cohomology class of the cocycle (3.24) lies in

$$Im(H_{\text{cts}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}) \rightarrow H^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R})).$$

It remains to be proved that the constructed class is a non-zero rational multiple of the Borel class in $H_{\text{cts}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R})$. Several possible proofs were outlined in

[G2]. In §5 a different proof will be given. It is based on an explicit formula for indecomposable element in $H_D^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet, \mathbb{R}(3))$

4. SOME ARGUMENTS FOR THE MAIN CONJECTURE

1. We have already seen before that $L(F)_{-1}^\vee$ must be isomorphic to $F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$.

2. **The Bloch-Suslin complex.** Let us define a subgroup $R_2(F) \subset \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}]$ as follows:

$$R_2(F) := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^4 (-1)^i \{r(x_0, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_4)\} , \quad x_i \in P_F^1, \quad x_i \neq x_j \right\} .$$

Then $\delta_2(R_2(F)) = 0$ according to lemma 3.6 ($\delta_2 : \{x\} \mapsto (1-x) \wedge x$). So we get a complex $B_F(2)$ (the Bloch-Suslin complex)

$$B_2(F) \xrightarrow{\delta} \Lambda^2 F^* , \quad B_2(F) := \frac{\mathbb{Z}[P_F^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}]}{R_2(F)} \quad (25)$$

where the group $B_2(F)$ placed in degree 1 and δ has degree +1. Let $K_3^{\text{ind}}(F) := \text{Coker}(K_3^M(F) \rightarrow K_3(F))$. Using some ideas of S. Bloch, A.A. Suslin proved the following remarkable theorem (see also closely related results of J. Dupont and S.-H. Sah [DS],[Sa], who computed $H^1(B_F(2))$ in terms of the 3-rd homology group of $SL_2(F)$).

Theorem 4.1 [S2] *There is an exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Tor}(F^*, F^*)^\sim \longrightarrow K_3^{\text{ind}}(F) \longrightarrow H^1(B_F(2)) \longrightarrow 0$$

where $\text{Tor}(F^*, F^*)^\sim$ is the unique nontrivial extension of $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ by $\text{Tor}(F^*, F^*)$.

In particular,

$$H^1(B_F(2)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \cong K_3^{\text{ind}}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \cong K_3^{[1]}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \cong gr_j^2 K_3(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} .$$

So the complex $B_F(2)$ has the same homology as the complex $L(F)_{-2}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \Lambda^2 L(F)_{-1}^\vee$. Assume that there is a homomorphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_2(F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \Lambda^2 F^* \\ \varphi_2 \downarrow & & \parallel \\ L(F)_{-2}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \Lambda^2 F^* \end{array} \quad (4.2)$$

that induces isomorphism on cohomologies modulo torsion. Then

$\varphi_2 : B_2(F) \rightarrow L(F)_{-2}^\vee$ must be an isomorphism.

In fact, the existence of a homomorphism of complexes (4.2) can be deduced from results of [BGSV], [BMS] and standard assumptions about the category $\mathcal{M}_T(F)$. After this, using the Borel theorem, one can prove that the induced homomorphism $H^1(B_F(2)_{\mathbb{Q}}) \rightarrow H_{(2)}^1(L(F)_\bullet)$ must be an isomorphism for number fields. Finally, the rigidity conjecture 1.7 tells us that the same is true for an arbitrary field F (see s.12 of §1 in [Go2]).

Note that theorem 4.1 and isomorphism $K_3^{\text{ind}}(F) \cong K_3^{\text{ind}}(F(t))$ imply that the canonical map $B_2(F) \rightarrow B_2(F)$, $(\{x\} \mapsto \{x\})$ is an isomorphism.

3. Weight 3 motivic complexes. Recall that the generalized cross-ratio $r_3 : C_6(P^2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$ is defined by the following formula

$$r_3(l_1, \dots, l_6) = \text{Alt} \left\{ \frac{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_4)\Delta(l_2, l_3, l_5)\Delta(l_3, l_1, l_6)}{\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_5)\Delta(l_2, l_3, l_6)\Delta(l_3, l_1, l_4)} \right\}.$$

Set

$$R_3(F) := \left\{ \sum_{i=0}^6 (-1)^i r_3(l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_6), \quad \text{where } (l_0, \dots, l_6) \in C_7(P^2) \right\}$$

$$B_3(F) := \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]/R_3(F), \{0\}, \{\infty\}.$$

Theorem 3.11 implies that $\delta_3(R_3(F)) = 0$, so we get a complex $B_F(3)$:

$$B_3(F) \xrightarrow{\delta} B_2(F) \otimes F^* \xrightarrow{\delta} \Lambda^3 F^*$$

where $B_3(F)$ placed in degree 1 and δ has degree +1.

Let us assume that there is a homomorphism $\varphi_3 : B_3(F) \longrightarrow L(F)_{-3}^\vee$ making the following diagram commutative (we have assumed $L(F)_{-2}^\vee \cong B_2(F)_\mathbb{Q}$, $L(F)_{-1}^\vee \cong F_\mathbb{Q}^*$):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_3(F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & B_2(F) \otimes F^* \\ \varphi_3 \downarrow & & \wr \downarrow \varphi_2 \otimes \varphi_1 \\ L(F)_{-3}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} & L(F)_{-2}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee \end{array}$$

Then we get a morphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} B_3(F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & B_2(F) \otimes F^* & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \Lambda^3 F^* \\ \varphi_3 \downarrow & & \wr \downarrow \varphi_2 \otimes \varphi_1 & & \wr \downarrow \Lambda^3 \varphi_1 \\ L(F)_{-3}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} & L(F)_{-2}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \Lambda^3 L(F)_{-1}^\vee \end{array}$$

The bottom complex is just $(\Lambda_{(3)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet), \partial)$: the part of grading 3 of the cochain complex of the Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$.

The results of §3 give considerable evidence for the expected isomorphisms

$$H^i(B_F(3)_\mathbb{Q}) \cong H^i(\Lambda_{(3)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet)) \quad (3)$$

(According to conjecture 3.19 and (1.3) both sides are expected to be isomorphic to $K_{6-i}^{[3-i]}(F)_\mathbb{Q}$). (4.3) implies that $\varphi_3 : B_3(F)_\mathbb{Q} \longrightarrow L(F)_{-3}^\vee$ is an isomorphism. I expect, of course, that $B_3(F)_\mathbb{Q} \cong \mathcal{B}_3(F)_\mathbb{Q}$.

In any case the complexes $(\Lambda_{(n)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet), \partial)$ for $n = 1, 2, 3$ look like the complexes $\Gamma(F; n)$. But already the weight 4 part of the cochain complex of $L(F)_\bullet$, that is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} L(F)_{-4}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \oplus & \begin{array}{c} L(F)_{-3}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee \\ \Lambda^2 L(F)_{-2}^\vee \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\partial} & L(F)_{-2}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^2 L(F)_{-1}^\vee & \xrightarrow{\partial} \\ & & & \xrightarrow{\partial} & & \Lambda^4 L(F)_{-1}^\vee & \end{array} \quad (4)$$

looks quite different from $\Gamma(F; 4)$, because we have an extra term $\Lambda^2 L(F)_{-2}^\vee$ ($4 = 2 + 2$) that has no analog in $\Gamma(F; 4)$. So assuming a homomorphism $\varphi_4 : \mathcal{B}_4(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee$ making (2.1b) commutative we get a morphism of complexes $\tilde{\varphi}_4 : \Gamma(F; 4) \rightarrow (\Lambda_{(4)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet), \partial)$, but it cannot be an isomorphism. However

Theorem 4.2 $\tilde{\varphi}_4 : H^3 \Gamma(F; 4) \rightarrow H^3(\Lambda_{(4)}^\bullet(L(F)_\bullet), \partial)$ is an isomorphism.

Proof. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(x, y) := & \varphi_3 \left[-\{1-x\} - \{1-y\} + \left\{ \frac{1-x}{1-y} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{1-x^{-1}}{1-y^{-1}} \right\} \right] \otimes \frac{x}{y} \\ & \varphi_3\{x\} \otimes (1-y) - \varphi_3\{y\} \otimes (1-x) + \varphi_3\left\{\frac{x}{y}\right\} \otimes \frac{1-x}{1-y} \\ & - \varphi_2\{x\} \wedge \varphi_2\{y\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

that lies in

$$L(F)_{-3}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee \oplus \Lambda^2 L(F)_{-2}^\vee = B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \Lambda^2 B_2(F).$$

Lemma 4.3 $\partial(\kappa(x, y)) = 0$.

Proof. Direct calculation. \square

Note that

$$\kappa(x, y) + \varphi_2\{x\} \wedge \varphi_2\{y\} \subset (\varphi_3 \otimes \varphi_1)(B_3(F) \otimes F^*) = L(F)_{-3}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee.$$

So it follows from lemma 4.3 that

$$\partial(\Lambda^2 L(F)_{-2}^\vee) \subset \partial(L(F)_{-3}^\vee \otimes L(F)_{-1}^\vee).$$

But this is the only fact that we need in order to prove theorem 4.2 \square

Corollary 4.4 Assume that for $n = 1, 2, 3$ we have isomorphisms $\varphi_n : \mathcal{B}_n(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \xrightarrow{\sim} L(F)_{-n}^\vee$ making diagram (2.1b) commutative. Then

$$H_{(n)}^{n-1}(L(F)_\bullet) \cong \frac{\text{Ker}(B_2(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \otimes \Lambda^{n-2} F_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \rightarrow \Lambda^n F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*)}{\{x\}_2 \otimes x \wedge \Lambda^{n-3} F_{\mathbb{Q}}^*}.$$

Proof. The left-hand side is just the cohomology of the following complex

$$\oplus \frac{L_{-3}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^{n-3} L_{-1}^\vee}{\Lambda^2 L_{-2}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^{n-4} L_{-1}^\vee} \xrightarrow{\partial} L_{-2}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^{n-2} L_{-1}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \Lambda^n L_{-1}^\vee.$$

It remains to apply theorem 4.2 \square

Lemma 4.3 tells us that an element $\varphi_4(x, y) \in L(F)_{-4}^\vee$ should exist such that

$$\partial \varphi_4(x, y) = \kappa(x, y)$$

(The reason is that $\Gamma(F, n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ should be a “resolution” for $K_n^M(F)$. See appendix in [G2].) Let us assume that such $\varphi_4(x, y)$ exists.

5. Weight 5 motivic complexes. The part of grading 5 of the cochain complex of $L(F)_\bullet$ looks as follows:

$$L_{-5}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \oplus \frac{L_{-4}^\vee \otimes L_{-1}^\vee}{L_{-3}^\vee \otimes L_{-2}^\vee} \xrightarrow{\partial} \oplus \frac{L_{-3}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^2 L_{-1}^\vee}{\Lambda^2 L_{-2}^\vee \otimes L_{-1}^\vee} \xrightarrow{\partial} L_{-2}^\vee \otimes \Lambda^3 L_{-1}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial} \Lambda^5 L_{-1}^\vee.$$

We would like to prove that the component $\partial_{3,2} : L_{-5}^\vee \longrightarrow L_{-3}^\vee \otimes L_{-2}^\vee$ of the coboundary ∂ is an epimorphism. Unfortunately it is not quite clear how to construct an element in L_{-5}^\vee because L_{-5}^\vee itself is a quite mysterious object. However, assuming the existence of $\phi_4(x, y)$ we can find an element in $L_{-4}^\vee \otimes L_{-1}^\vee \oplus L_{-3}^\vee \otimes L_{-2}^\vee$ with zero coboundary, whose component in $L_{-3}^\vee \otimes L_{-2}^\vee$ is $\varphi_3\{x\} \otimes \varphi_2\{y\}$. We expect that such a cycle should be in $\varphi(L_{-5}^\vee)$.

Let us do this. We assume a $\varphi_4 : \mathcal{B}_4(F) \longrightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee$ making (2.1b) commutative exists. Consider the following element

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_5(x, y) := & \phi_4(x, y) \otimes \frac{x}{y} + \varphi_4 \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \right\} \otimes \frac{1-x}{1-y} + \varphi_4\{x\} \otimes (1-y) + \\ & + \varphi_4(y) \otimes (1-x) - \varphi_3\{x\} \otimes \varphi_2\{y\} - \varphi_3\{y\} \otimes \varphi_2\{x\}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Lemma 4.5 $\partial\phi_5(x, y) = 0$.

Proof. Direct calculations using formula (4.5) for $\partial\phi_4(x, y) = \kappa(x, y)$.

The $L_{-3}^\vee \otimes L_{-2}^\vee$ component of $-1/2(\phi_5(x, y) + \phi_5(x, y^{-1}))$ is equal to $\varphi_3\{x\} \otimes \varphi_2\{y\}$ because $\{y\}_2 + \{y^{-1}\}_2 = 0$ in $B_2(F)_\mathbb{Q}$ and $\{y\}_3 = \{y^{-1}\}_3$ in $B_3(F)_\mathbb{Q}$.

We can pursue this idea further and “construct” by induction elements $\phi_n(x, y) \in L(F)_{-n}^\vee$ (using the same assumptions as above) such that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial\phi_n(x, y) = & \phi_{n-1}(x, y) \otimes \frac{x}{y} + \varphi_{n-1} \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \right\} \otimes \frac{1-x}{1-y} + \quad (4.7)_n \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} (-1)^{k-1} (\varphi_{n-k}\{x\} \otimes \varphi_k\{y\} + (-1)^{n-k} \varphi_{n-k}\{y\} \otimes \varphi_k\{x\}) \end{aligned}$$

for n odd; for n even we have the same formula, but the last term will be $(-1)^{n/2-1} \varphi_{n/2}\{x\} \wedge \varphi_{n/2}\{y\}$. (Here $\varphi_1(a) := 1 - a \in F^*$).

Proposition 4.6 *Suppose that $\partial\phi_{n-1}(x, y)$ is given by formula (4.7)_(n-1). Then the coboundary of the right hand side of (4.7)_n is equal to 0.*

Proof. Direct calculation using the formula

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(\phi_{n-1}(x, y) \otimes \frac{x}{y} + \varphi_{n-1} \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \right\} \otimes \frac{1-x}{1-y}) = \\ \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} (-1)^{k-1} (\varphi_{n-k}\{x\} \otimes \varphi_k\{y\} + (-1)^{n-k} \varphi_{n-k}\{y\} \otimes \varphi_k\{x\}) \end{aligned}$$

(for n odd the last term in this sum should be $(-1)^{\frac{n-1}{2}-1} \varphi_{\frac{n-1}{2}}\{x\} \wedge \varphi_{\frac{n-1}{2}}\{y\}$).

6. Nonexistence of natural generators for $L(F)_{\leq -2}$ inside $L(F)_\bullet$. Let us choose a splitting $s : \mathcal{B}_4^\vee \longrightarrow L_{-4}$ of the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow [L_{-2}, L_{-2}] \longrightarrow L_{-4} \xrightarrow{s} \mathcal{B}_4^\vee \longrightarrow 0$$

This means that we make a choice of degree -4 generators for $L(F)_{\leq -2}$. Then the composition of the commutator map $L_{-3} \otimes L_{-1} \longrightarrow L_{-4}$ with the projection

of L_{-4} along $s(\mathcal{B}_4^\vee)$ gives us a homomorphism

$$L_{-3} \otimes L_{-1} \longrightarrow \wedge^2 L_{-2} .$$

Assume that $L(F)_{-i} = B_i(F)^\vee$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then dualising we get a homomorphism

$$p : B_2(F) \wedge B_2(F) \longrightarrow B_3(F) \otimes F^* . \quad (8)$$

The following result, proved in collaboration with D. Zagier, shows that there is no any such a reasonable non-zero map! More precisely, let us call a map p *natural* if it is given by the following formula

$$p : \{x\}_2 \wedge \{y\}_2 \mapsto \sum_i \{\varphi_i(x, y)\}_3 \otimes \psi_i(x, y) \quad (9)$$

where $\varphi_i(x, y)$ and $\psi_i(x, y)$ are rational functions with coefficients in \mathbb{Q} .

Theorem 4.7 *There is no natural non-zero homomorphism (4.8).*

Proof. In the case $F = \mathbb{C}$ there is a homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} l : B_3(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^* &\longrightarrow B_2(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^* \otimes \mathbb{C}^* \longrightarrow R \\ l : \{z_1\}_3 \otimes z_2 &\mapsto \mathcal{L}_2(z_1) \cdot \log |z_1| \cdot \log |z_2| . \end{aligned}$$

Consider the composition

$$\begin{aligned} B_2(\mathbb{C}) \wedge B_2(\mathbb{C}) &\xrightarrow{p} B_3(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^* \xrightarrow{l} R \\ l \circ p : \{x\}_2 \wedge \{y\}_2 &\mapsto \sum_i \mathcal{L}_2(\varphi_i(x, y)) \cdot \log |\varphi_i(x, y)| \cdot \log |\psi_i(x, y)| . \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The right-hand side of (4.10) satisfies the 5-term functional equation in variable x (as well as in y) because both p and l are homomorphisms and so $l \circ p(R_2(\mathbb{C}) \wedge \{y\}_2) = 0$. From the other hand we have the following beautiful result of S. Bloch [B11])

Theorem 4.8 *Let $f(z)$ be a measurable function satisfying the 5-term relation $\sum_{i=1}^5 (-1)^i \mathcal{L}_2(r(x_1, \dots, \hat{x}_i, \dots, x_5)) = 0$. Then $f(z) = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_2(z)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. \square*

Applying this theorem to the right-hand side of (4.10) considered as a function in x and then as a function in y we get

$$\sum_i \mathcal{L}_2(\varphi_i(x, y)) \cdot \log |\varphi_i(x, y)| \cdot \log |\psi_i(x, y)| = \lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_2(x) \cdot \mathcal{L}_2(y) . \quad (11)$$

The left expression is skewsymmetric in x, y because of its definition (4.10), while $\lambda \cdot \mathcal{L}_2(x) \cdot \mathcal{L}_2(y)$ is obviously symmetric. So $\lambda = 0$.

There is another argument: the right-hand side of (4.11) is invariant under the involution $x \mapsto \bar{x}, y \mapsto \bar{y}$, while the left one is skew invariant. (It works for a homomorphism $\tilde{p} : B_2 \otimes B_2 \longrightarrow B_3 \otimes F^*$). Therefore $\lambda = 0$.

This is the crucial point and now it becomes absolutely clear that theorem 4.7 is true. However we will present a rigorous proof.

Let us choose a generic number $y_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. There is a natural basis $(x - a)$, $a \in \mathbb{C}$ in the \mathbb{Q} -vector space $\mathbb{C}(x)^* / \mathbb{C}^* \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Using this basis we can rewrite (4.9) as follows

($\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_i \{\varphi_i(x, y_0)\}_3 \otimes \psi_i(x, y_0) &= \sum_{i,j} n_j^i \{f_i^j(x)\}_3 \otimes (x - a_i) + \\ &+ \sum_j n_j^0 \{f_0^j(x)\}_3 \otimes \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.11) is of the form $\sum_i A_i(x) + A_0(x)$ where

$$A_i(x) := \sum_{i,j} n_j^i \mathcal{L}_2(f_i^j(x)) \cdot \log |f_i^j(x)| \cdot \log |x - a_i|. \quad (12)$$

The function $\mathcal{L}_2(z)$ is real-analytic on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$, continuous on $\mathbb{C}P^1$ and has a singularity of type $r \cdot \log r$ at $z = 0, 1, \infty$. Therefore for any $k > 0$ the functions $A_k(x)$ and $A_{\neq k}(x) := \sum_{i \neq k} A_i(x) + A_0(x)$ have the following singularity near $x = a_k$:

$$\begin{aligned} A_k(x) &: r^{2m} \log^{m+1} r \quad \text{or} \quad r^m \log^{m+2} r & (m \geq 0) \\ A_{\neq k}(x) &: r^{2m} \log^m r \quad \text{or} \quad r^m \log^{m+1} r & (m \geq 1) \end{aligned}$$

For example, if $f_k^j(x) = 1 - c \cdot (x - a_k)^m + \dots$ then $A_k(x)$ has singularity of type $r^{2m} \log^{m+1} r$. Fortunately all pairs $(2m, m+1)$, $m \geq 0$; $(m, m+2)$, $m \geq 0$; $(2m, m)$, $m \geq 1$; $(m, m+1)$, $m \geq 1$ are different. (For example $(2m, m+1) = (m, m+1)$ only if $m = 0$, but in our situation $m \geq 1$ for $(m, m+1)$.) This means that the singularities of $A_k(x)$ never coincide with the one of $A_{\neq k}(x)$ and hence $A_k(x) + A_{\neq k}(x) = 0$ implies

$$\sum_j n_j^k \mathcal{L}_2(f_k^j(x)) \cdot \log |f_k^j(x)| \equiv 0. \quad (13)$$

Now let us prove that

$$\sum_j n_j^k \{f_k^j(x)\}_2 \otimes f_k^j(x) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_2(\mathbb{C}(x)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(x)^*.$$

Let us decompose this element using our basis in $\mathbb{C}(x)^*/\mathbb{C}^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j n_j^k \{f_k^j(x)\}_2 \otimes f_k^j(x) &= \\ &= \sum_{m,n} c_n^m \{g_m^n(x)\}_2 \otimes (x - b_m) + \sum c_n^0 \{g_0^n(x)\}_2 \otimes \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Then (4.13) is of the form

$$\sum_{m,n} c_n^m \mathcal{L}_2(f_k^j(x)) \cdot \log |x - b_m| + \sum c_n^0 \mathcal{L}_2(g_0^n(x)) \cdot \log |\beta| = 0.$$

Looking on the type of singularities of this expression near $x = b_m$ it is easy to see that for any m

$$\sum_n c_n^m \mathcal{L}_2(g_m^n(x)) \equiv 0.$$

Proposition 4.9 *If $\sum_n c_n \mathcal{L}_2(f_n(x)) \equiv 0$ for some $f_n(x) \in \mathbb{C}(x)$ then for all complex numbers z*

$$\sum_n c_n \{f_n(z)\}_2 - \sum_n c_n \{f_n(0)\}_2 = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_2(\mathbb{C}).$$

Proof. Let

$$\delta_2\left(\sum_n c_n \{f_n(x)\}_2\right) = \sum_i (x - \alpha_i) \wedge (x - \beta_i) + \sum_j \delta_j \wedge (x - \gamma_j) + \sum_i \varepsilon_i \otimes \xi_i .$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= d\left(\sum_n c_n \mathcal{L}_2(f_n(x))\right) = \sum_i -(\log|x - \alpha_i| \cdot d \arg(x - \beta_i) + \\ &+ \log|x - \beta_i| d \arg(x - \alpha_i)) - \sum_j \log|\delta_j| d \arg(x - \gamma_j) . \end{aligned}$$

Now look on singularity of the right-hand side at $x = \alpha_i$. The first term has singularity of type $\log r$, while $d \arg(x - \alpha_i)$ has different type of singularity because

$$d \arg z = \frac{-ydx + xdy}{x^2 + y^2} , \quad z = x + iy .$$

Therefore $\delta_2(\sum_n c_n \{f_n(x)\}_2) = 0$ and so by definition

$$\sum_n c_n \{f_n(z)\}_2 - \sum_n c_n \{f_n(0)\}_2 \in R_2(\mathbb{C}) . \quad (14)$$

□

Let us decompose the element $(\delta_3 \otimes id) \circ p(\{x\}_2 \wedge \{y_0\}_2)$ using the basis $(x - b_j) \otimes (x - a_i)$, $(x - b_j) \otimes \alpha_i$, $\beta_j \otimes (x - \alpha_i)$, $\beta_j \otimes \alpha_i$ in $\mathbb{C}(x)_{\mathbb{Q}}^* \otimes \mathbb{C}(x)_{\mathbb{Q}}^*$:

$$(\delta_3 \otimes id) \circ p(\{x\}_2 \wedge \{y_0\}_2) = \sum_{i,j} (\alpha_{ij})_2 \otimes (x - b_j) \otimes (x - a_i) + \dots$$

where $(\alpha_{ij})_2 \in B_2(\mathbb{C})$. Insert into this formula the 5-term relation

$$\{x\}_2 - \{z\}_2 + \{z/x\}_2 - \left\{ \frac{1 - x^{-1}}{1 - z^{-1}} \right\}_2 + \left\{ \frac{1 - x}{1 - z} \right\}_2$$

instead of $\{x\}_2$. It is easy to see that for generic $z \in \mathbb{C}$ $(x - b_j) \otimes (x - a_i)$ will appear with coefficient $(\alpha_{ij})_2$. Hence $(\alpha_{ij})_2 = 0$. Pursuing further this argument we get

$$(\delta_3 \otimes id) \circ p(\{x\}_2 \wedge \{y_0\}_2) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_2(\mathbb{C}(x)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(x)^* \otimes \mathbb{C}(x)^* .$$

So for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$

$$p(\{x\}_2 \wedge \{y_0\}_2) - p(\{x_0\}_2) = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_3(\mathbb{C}) \otimes \mathbb{C}^* .$$

The same argument with the 5-term relation as above shows that in fact $p(\{x\}_2 \wedge \{y_0\}_2) = 0$. Using this it is easy to complete the proof of theorem 4.7. □

7. Recall that one of the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum axioms predicts existence of the tensor product of motivic complexes $\Gamma(n) \overset{L}{\otimes} \Gamma(m) \longrightarrow \Gamma(n + m)$ defined in the derived category. Theorem 4.7 implies that for our complexes $\Gamma(F; n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ natural tensor product exists as a morphism in the derived category *only* and cannot be defined at the level of complexes even for $m = n = 2$.

Indeed, an essential ingredient of construction of a natural morphism of complexes

$$\begin{array}{c}
[(B_2 \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^2 F^*) \otimes (B_2 \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^2 F^*)] \\
\downarrow m_{2,2} \\
[\mathcal{B}_4 \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_3 \otimes F^* \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{B}_2 \otimes \wedge^2 F^* \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^4 F^*]
\end{array}$$

is the existence of the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
B_2 \otimes B_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta \otimes id - id \otimes \delta} & B_2 \otimes \wedge^2 F^* \oplus \wedge^2 F^* \otimes B_2 \\
\downarrow m_{2,2}^{(2)} & & \downarrow m_{2,2}^{(3)} \\
\mathcal{B}_3 \otimes F^* & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}_2 \otimes \wedge^2 F^*
\end{array} \tag{4.15}$$

But $m_{2,2}^{(2)}$ must be zero by theorem 4.7 and $m_{2,2}^{(3)}$ should be equal to $(id, id \circ s)$ where s is the switch, so (4.15) cannot be commutative.

I am completely sure there is the same situation with tensor products of complexes $\Gamma(F, *)$ for any $m \geq 2, n \geq 2$.

Notice that we have a natural homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta(k) : \mathcal{B}_n &\longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_{n-k} \otimes \underbrace{F^* \otimes \dots \otimes F^*}_{k \text{ times}} \\
\delta(k) &:= (\delta \otimes id) \circ \delta(k-1) ; \quad \delta(1) := \delta .
\end{aligned}$$

Conjecture 4.10 *The only nontrivial natural homomorphisms $\otimes_i \mathcal{B}_i \longrightarrow \otimes_j \mathcal{B}_j$ are (up to a permutation) tensor products of the homomorphisms $\delta(k)$.*

Finally look at the tensor product $\Gamma(1) \otimes \Gamma(1) \longrightarrow \Gamma(2)$, i.e. $F^* \otimes F^* \longrightarrow \Gamma(2)$.

Theorem 4.1 suggests that it should be defined in the derived category: $F^* \xrightarrow{L} F^* \longrightarrow \Gamma(2)$, providing $\text{Tor}(F^*, F^*) \subset H^1(\Gamma(2))$.

8. The structure of the Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$: conclusions. For each $n \geq 1$ there is a canonical monomorphism

$$\phi_n : \mathcal{B}_n(F) \longrightarrow L(F)_{-n}^\vee$$

It is isomorphism for $n = 1, 2, 3$. However, **it is not surjective for $n \geq 4$** . Let us define groups $L(F)_{-n}^\vee$ for $n = 4, 5$. Set

$$L(F)_{-4}^\vee := \frac{\mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]}{\mathcal{R}l_4(F)}$$

Here $\mathcal{R}l_4(F)$ is the "connected component of zero" of the kernel of the following homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_4 : \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] &\longrightarrow B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F) \\
\{a\} + \{x\} \wedge \{y\} &\longmapsto \{a\} \otimes a + \kappa(x, y)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa(x, y)$ is given by formula (4.5). More precisely this means the following (compare with definition 1.10). Let $\mathcal{A}_4(F) := \text{Ker } \partial_4$. Any element

$$\alpha(t) = \{a_i(t)\} + \{x_i(t)\} \wedge \{y_i(t)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_{F(t)}^1] + \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_{F(t)}^1]$$

has a specialisation

$$\alpha(t_0) = \{\alpha_i(t_0)\} + \{x_i(t_0)\} \wedge \{y_i(t_0)\} \in \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] + \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$$

Definition 4.11 $\mathcal{R}l_4(F)$ is generated by elements $\alpha(0) - \alpha(1)$ where $\alpha(t)$ runs through all elements of $\mathcal{A}_4(F(t))$ and also $\{0\}, \{\infty\}, \{0\} \wedge \{x\}, \{\infty\} \wedge \{x\}$.

The natural map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] &\longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \\ \{a\} &\longmapsto \{a\} \end{aligned}$$

induces an inclusion $\mathcal{R}_4(F) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}l_4(F)$. So we get a homomorphism

$$\phi_4 : \mathcal{B}_4(F) \longrightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee$$

It is clear from the definitions of subgroups $\mathcal{R}_4(F)$ and $\mathcal{R}l_4(F)$ that ϕ_4 is a monomorphism. Further, there is a natural projection

$$\tilde{p}_4 : \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \longrightarrow \wedge^2 B_2(F).$$

It follows from the definition that $\tilde{p}_4(\mathcal{R}l_4(F)) = 0$, so we get an epimorphism

$$p_4 : L(F)_{-4}^\vee \longrightarrow \wedge^2 B_2(F)$$

Therefore we obtain a sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow B_4(F) \xrightarrow{\phi_4} L(F)_{-4}^\vee \xrightarrow{p_4} \wedge^2 B_2(F) \longrightarrow 0$$

It should be exact. To prove this one should find an element $S(x, y, z) \in B_4(F)$ such that

$$\delta_4(S_4(x, y, z)) + \tilde{k}(r_2(x, y), z) = 0, \quad S_4(0, 0; 0) = 0.$$

where

$$r_2(x, y) := \{x\} - \{y\} + \left\{ \frac{x}{y} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{1-x^{-1}}{1-y^{-1}} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{1-x}{1-y} \right\}$$

and $\tilde{k}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a homomorphism

$$\tilde{k}(\cdot, \cdot) : \wedge^2 \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \longrightarrow B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F)$$

given on generators by formula $\tilde{k}(x, y) := k(x, y)$. Let us suppose that such an element exists. Then $S(x, y, z) + r_2(x, y) \wedge \{z\} \in \mathcal{R}l_4(F)$. From the other hand $\text{Ker } \tilde{p} = \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus R_2(F) \wedge \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]$ and the subgroup $R_2(F)$ is generated by elements $r_2(x, y)$. So $\text{Ker } p_4 = B_4(F)$. The homomorphism ∂_4 provides us with a coboundary

$$\partial_4 : L(F)_{-4}^\vee \longrightarrow B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F)$$

According to lemma 4.3 the composition

$$L(F)_{-4}^\vee \xrightarrow{\partial_4} B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F) \xrightarrow{\partial_4} B_2(F) \otimes \wedge^2 F^*$$

is equal to zero, where the second coboundary is $\delta_3 \otimes id + \delta_2 \wedge id$. Theorem 4.9 just means that there is no natural section $s_4 : \wedge^2 B_2(F) \longrightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee$, ($p_4 \circ s_4 = id$)
Indeed, the composition

$$s_4 \circ \partial_4 : \wedge^2 B_2(F) \longrightarrow B_3(F) \otimes F^* \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F)$$

must have a non-zero $B_3 \otimes F^*$ -component. But according to theorem 4.9 there is no such a natural non-zero homomorphism. So the sequence has no natural splitting. Let us denote by $\phi_4(x, y)$ the image of $\{x\} \wedge \{y\}$ to $L(F)_{-4}^\vee$. Set

$$L(F)_{-5}^\vee := \frac{\mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \oplus \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1]}{\mathcal{R}l_5(F)}$$

where $\mathcal{R}l_5(F)$ is the "connected component of zero" of kernel of the following homomorphism

$$\partial_5 : \{a\} + \{x\} \otimes \{y\} \mapsto \phi_4\{a\} \otimes a + \Phi_5(x, y)$$

where (compare with (4.6))

$$\Phi_5(x, y) = \frac{1}{2}(\tilde{\phi}_5(x, y) - \tilde{\phi}_5(x, y^{-1}))$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_5(x, y) := & \phi_4(x, y) \otimes \frac{x}{y} + \phi_4\left\{\frac{x}{y}\right\} \otimes \frac{1-x}{1-y} + \phi_4\{x\} \otimes (1-y) + \phi_4\{y\} \otimes (1-x) \\ & - \phi_3\{x\} \otimes \phi_2\{x\} - \phi_3\{y\} \otimes \phi_2\{x\} \end{aligned}$$

There is a sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_5(F) \xrightarrow{\phi_5} L(F)_{-5}^\vee \xrightarrow{p_5} B_3(F) \otimes B_2(F) \longrightarrow 0$$

where ϕ_5 is a monomorphism and p_5 is an epimorphism. This sequence should be exact. To prove this one should find some elements $S_5(x, y, z)$ and $S_5((l_0, \dots, l_6); z)$ in $\mathcal{B}_5(F)$ such that

$$\delta_5(S_5(x, y, z)) + \tilde{\Phi}_5(\{z\}, r_2(x, y)) = 0$$

$$\delta_5(S_5((l_0, \dots, l_6); z)) + \tilde{\Phi}_5\left(\sum_{i=1}^6 (-1)^i r_3(l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_6), \{z\}\right) = 0$$

Here $\tilde{\Phi}_5(\cdot, \cdot)$ is considered as a homomorphism

$$\tilde{\Phi}_5(\cdot, \cdot) : B_3(F) \otimes B_2(F) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}_4(F) \otimes F^* \oplus B_3(F) \otimes B_2(F)$$

and r_3 is the generalised cross-ratio (3.9). This sequence has no natural splitting. In any case we have a well-defined coboundary

$$\partial_5 : L(F)_{-5}^\vee \longrightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee \otimes F^* \oplus B_3(F) \otimes B_2(F)$$

The composition

$$\partial_5 : L(F)_{-5}^\vee \longrightarrow L(F)_{-4}^\vee \otimes F^* \oplus B_3(F) \otimes B_2(F) \longrightarrow \oplus \wedge^2 B_2(F) \otimes F^*$$

is equal to zero (the second differential comes from the standard cochain complex of the Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$). So we have constructed the weight 5 part of the standard cochain complex of $L(F)_\bullet$. I believe that there is a similar construction of the groups $L(F)_{-n}^\vee$ for all n . This would imply a precise construction of the motivic Lie algebra $L(F)_\bullet$. Explicit formulas for $S_4(x, y, z)$, $S_5(z; x, y)$ and $S_5(l_0, \dots, l_6; z)$ would give us functional equations for 4 and 5-logarithms and an explicit definition of tensor product of motivic complexes

$$\Gamma(F, n)_\mathbb{Q} \otimes^L \Gamma(F, m)_\mathbb{Q} \longrightarrow \Gamma(F, n+m)_\mathbb{Q}$$

for $n = 2, m = 2$ and $n = 2, m = 3$. Let us consider in more details the case $n = 2, m = 2$. Let $\tilde{R}_2(F)$ be a free abelian group generated by configurations (l_0, \dots, l_4) of 5 distinct points in P_F^1 . There is a complex $\tilde{B}_F(2)$:

$$0 \longrightarrow \tilde{R}_2(F) \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \xrightarrow{\delta} \wedge^2 F^*$$

where $\delta(l_0, \dots, l_4) := \sum_{i=0}^4 \{r(l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_4)\}$ and $\tilde{R}_2(F)$ placed in degree 0. It is canonically quasisomorphic to the Bloch-Suslin complex. Let us define a tensor product

$$\tilde{m}_{2,2} : \tilde{B}_F(2) \otimes \tilde{B}_F(2) \longrightarrow \Gamma(F, 4)_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{m}_{2,2}(x_1 \wedge x_2 \otimes y_1 \wedge y_2) &= x_1 \wedge x_2 \wedge y_1 \wedge y_2 \in \wedge^4 F^* \\ \tilde{m}_{2,2}(\{x\} \otimes y_1 \wedge y_2) &= \tilde{m}_{2,2}(y_1 \wedge y_2 \otimes \{x\}) = \{x\} \otimes y_1 \wedge y_2 \in B_2(F) \otimes F^* \\ \tilde{m}_{2,2}(\{x\} \otimes \{y\}) &= \kappa(x, y) + \phi_2(x) \wedge \phi_2(y) \\ \tilde{m}_{2,2}((0, \infty, 1, x, y); z) &= S_4(x, y; z) \\ \tilde{m}_{2,2}((0, \infty, 1, x, y), (0, \infty, 1, z, t)) &= S_4(x, y; r_2(z, t)) + S_4(z, t; r_2(x, y)) \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that

$$\delta_4(S_4(x, y; r_2(z, t)) + S_4(z, t; r_2(x, y))) = 0$$

So

$$S_4(x, y; r_2(z, t)) + S_4(z, t; r_2(x, y)) \in \mathcal{R}_4(F)$$

and, according to theorem 1.15, we would get a functional equations for tetralogarithm. Therefore the elements $S_4(x, y; z)$ would provide us with a tensor product of Bloch-Suslin complexes and a functional equation for tetralogarithm. The case $n = 2, m = 3$ can be considered in complete analogy with the first one.

5. EXPLICIT FORMULAS FOR THE UNIVERSAL CHERN CLASS $c_3 \in H_?^6(BGL_{3\bullet}, \mathbb{Q}(3))$ IN MOTIVIC AND DELIGNE COHOMOLOGY

1. The third motivic complex $\Gamma(X; 3)$ for a regular scheme (see s. 14 of §1 in [G2]). Let F be a field with a discrete valuation v and the residue class $\bar{F}_v (= \bar{F})$. The group of units U has a natural homomorphism $U \longrightarrow \bar{F}^*$, $u \mapsto \bar{u}$. An element $\pi \in F^*$ is prime if $\text{ord}_v \pi = 1$. Let us construct a canonical homomorphism of complexes

$$\partial_v : \Gamma(F, n) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\bar{F}_v, n-1)[-1] \tag{2}$$

such that the induced homomorphism

$$H^n(\Gamma(F, n)) = K_n^M(F) \longrightarrow H^{n-1}(\Gamma(\bar{F}_v, n-1)) = K_{n-1}^M(\bar{F}_v)$$

coincides with Milnor's tame symbol on $K_n^M(F)$.

There is a homomorphism $\theta : \wedge^n F^* \longrightarrow \wedge^{n-1} \bar{F}_v^*$ uniquely defined by the following properties ($u_i \in U$):

- (1) $\theta(\pi \wedge u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_{n-1}) = \bar{u}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \bar{u}_{n-1}$.
- (2) $\theta(u_1 \wedge \dots \wedge u_n) = 0$.

It clearly does not depend on the choice of π .

Let us define a homomorphism $s_v : \mathbb{Z}[P_F^1] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[P_{\bar{F}_v}^1]$ as follows

$$s_v\{x\} = \begin{cases} \{\bar{x}\} & \text{if } x \text{ is a unit} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} .$$

Then it induces a homomorphism (see s. 9 §1 of [G2])

$$s_v : \mathcal{B}_k(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_k(\bar{F}_v) .$$

Set

$$\partial_v := s_v \otimes \theta : \mathcal{B}_k(F) \otimes \wedge^{n-k} F^* \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_k(\bar{F}_v) \otimes \wedge^{n-k-1} \bar{F}_v^* .$$

Lemma 5.1 *The homomorphism ∂_v commutes with the coboundary δ and hence defines a homomorphism of complexes (5.1).*

See s. 14 of §1 in [G2] □

Now let X be an arbitrary regular scheme, $X^{(i)}$ the set of all codimension i points of X , $F(x)$ the field of functions corresponding to a point $x \in X^{(i)}$. We define the third motivic complex $\Gamma(X; 3)$ as the total complex associated with the following bicomplex:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \wedge^3 F(X)^* & \xrightarrow{\partial_1} & \prod_{x \in X^{(1)}} \wedge^2 F(x)^* & \xrightarrow{\partial_2} & \prod_{x \in X^{(2)}} F(x)^* & \xrightarrow{\partial_3} & \prod_{x \in X^{(3)}} \mathbb{Z} \\ \uparrow \delta & & \uparrow \delta & & & & \\ \mathcal{B}_2(F(X)) \otimes F(X)^* & \xrightarrow{\partial_1} & \prod_{x \in X^{(1)}} \mathcal{B}_2(F(X)) & & & & \\ \uparrow \delta & & & & & & \end{array} \quad (5.2)$$

$\mathcal{B}_3(F(X))$ where $\mathcal{B}_3(F(X))$ placed in degree 1 and coboundaries have degree +1. $\partial = \oplus \partial_{v_x}$

The coboundaries ∂_i are defined as follows. $\partial_1 := \prod_{x \in X^{(1)}} \partial_{v_x}$. The others are a little bit more complicated. Let $x \in X^{(k)}$ and $v_1(y), \dots, v_m(y)$ be all discrete valuations of the field $F(x)$ over a point $y \in X^{(k+1)}$, $y \in \bar{x}$. Then $\bar{F}(x)_i := \bar{F}(x)_{v_i(y)} \supset F(y)$. (If \bar{x} is nonsingular at the point y , then $\bar{F}(x)_i = F(y)$ and $m = 1$). Let us define a homomorphism $\partial_2 : \wedge^2 F(x) \rightarrow F(y)^*$ as the composition

$$\wedge^2 F(x)^* \xrightarrow{\oplus \partial_{v_i(y)}} \oplus_{i=1}^m \bar{F}(x)_i^* \xrightarrow{\oplus N_{F(x)_i/F(y)}} F(y)^*$$

and $\partial_3 : F(x)^* \rightarrow \prod_{y \in X^{(3)}} \mathbb{Z}$ as the composition

$$F(x)^* \xrightarrow{\oplus \partial_{v_i}} \oplus_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\sum} \mathbb{Z}$$

2. Explicit formula for the motivic Chern class $c_3 \in H_{\mathcal{M}}^6(BGL_3(F)_\bullet, \mathbb{Z}(3))$.

Set $G^n := \underbrace{G \times \dots \times G}_{n \text{ times}}$. Recall that

$$BG_\bullet := pt \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{s_0} \\ \xleftarrow{s_1} \end{array} G \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{s_0} \\ \xleftarrow{s_2} \end{array} G^2 \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{s_0} \\ \xleftarrow{s_3} \end{array} G^3 \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{s_0} \\ \xleftarrow{s_4} \end{array} \dots$$

is the simplicial scheme representing the classifying space of the group G . There is canonical G -bundle over BG_\bullet (G acts on the left on EG_\bullet).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 EG_\bullet & & G & \longleftarrow & G^2 & \longleftarrow & G^3 & \cdots & G^4 & \cdots \\
 \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 BG_\bullet & & pt & \longleftarrow & G^1 & \longleftarrow & G^2 & \cdots & G^3 & \cdots
 \end{array} \tag{5.3}$$

The cochain we have to construct lives in the following bicomplex (we will show a part on diagram 5.4 and the remaining one on (5.5))

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \vdots & & \vdots \\
 \vdots & \uparrow \delta & \vdots \\
 \wedge^3 F(G^3)^* \oplus (\text{II}) & \xrightarrow{s^*} & \wedge^3 F(G^4)^* \oplus \coprod_{x \in \mathfrak{G}(G^4)^{(1)}} \mathcal{B}_2(F(x)) \\
 & & \uparrow \delta \\
 & & \mathcal{B}_2(F(G^4)) \otimes F(G^4)^* \xrightarrow{s^*} \mathcal{B}_2(F(G^5)) \otimes F(G^5)^* \\
 & & \uparrow \delta \\
 & & \mathcal{B}_3(F(G^5)) \xrightarrow{s^*} \mathcal{B}_3(F(G^6))
 \end{array} \tag{5.4}$$

Here $s^* := \sum (-1)^i s_i^*$, and $(\text{II}) := \coprod_{x \in \mathfrak{G}(G^3)^{(1)}} \mathcal{B}_2(F(x))$.

Let v be a non-zero vector in a three-dimensional vector space V^3 over F . Put for a generic 5-tuple (g_1, \dots, g_5) of elements of the group $GL(3)$ (see section 3 of §3)

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_0(g_1, \dots, g_5) &:= r_3(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_5 v) \in \mathcal{B}_3(F(G^5)) \\
 m_1(g_1, \dots, g_4) &:= -f_5(3)(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_4 v) \in \mathcal{B}_2(F(G^4)) \otimes F(G^4)^* \\
 m_2(g_1, g_2, g_3) &:= f_4(3)(v, g_1 v, g_2 v, g_3 v) \in \wedge^3 F(G^3)^*
 \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.2 a) $s^* m_0 = 0$

b) $s^* m_1 + \delta m_0 = 0$

c) $s^* m_2 + \delta m_1 = 0$.

Proof. a) follows from the definition of $\mathcal{B}_3(F)$ and existence of the homomorphism $\mathcal{B}_3(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_3(F)$.

b) is equivalent to theorem 3.10.

c) follows from proposition 3.7 and the following simple but important remark:

$\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3)$ appears in formula (3.7) with factor $\{r(l_4|l_1, l_2, l_3, l_5)\}_2 - \{r(l_5|l_1, l_2, l_3, l_4)\}_2$ that is zero if $\Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3) = 0$. (This implies that $\mathcal{B}_2(F(x))$ -component of δm_1 is zero for any $x \in (G^4)^{(1)}$) \square

We see that this part of construction of cocycle c_3 is essentially equivalent to a construction of a homomorphism of complexes (3.2). The remaining part of bicomplex (5.4) looks as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \prod_{x \in G^{(3)}} \mathbb{Z} & & \\
 \uparrow \partial_3 & & \\
 \prod_{x \in G^{(2)}} F(x)^* & \xrightarrow{s^*} & \prod_{x \in (G^2)^{(2)}} F(x)^* & (5.5) \\
 & & \uparrow \partial_2 & \\
 & & \prod_{x \in (G^2)^{(1)}} F(x)^* & \xrightarrow{s^*} & \prod_{x \in (G^3)^{(1)}} \wedge^2 F(x)^* \\
 & & & & \uparrow \partial_1 \\
 & & & & \wedge^3 F(G^3)^* \oplus (\text{II}) \quad \vdots
 \end{array}$$

Let us describe the corresponding components of the cocycle c_3 . Put

$$\mathcal{D}_{v,1} = \{(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G \mid \Delta(v, g_1 v, g_2 v) = 0\}.$$

For generic $(g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{D}_{v,1}$ we have $\dim \langle v, g_1 v, g_2 v \rangle = 2$, so we can set

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_3(g_1, g_2) &:= -6(\Delta_2(v, g_1 v) \wedge \Delta_2(v, g_2 v) - \Delta_2(g_1 v, v) \wedge \Delta_2(g_1 v, g_2 v) \\
 &\quad + \Delta_2(g_2 v, v) \wedge \Delta_2(g_2 v, g_1 v)) \in \wedge^2 F(\mathcal{D}_{v,1})^*.
 \end{aligned}$$

(Δ_2 is defined using a volume form in $\langle v, g_1 v, g_2 v \rangle$).

Lemma 5.3. $s^* m_3 + \partial_1 m_2 = 0$.

Proof. This is equivalent to the following: $\Delta(l_0, l_1, l_2)$ appears in formula

$$f_4(3)(l_0, l_1, l_2, l_3) = \text{Alt} \Delta(l_0, l_1, l_2) \wedge \Delta(l_0, l_1, l_3) \wedge \Delta(l_0, l_2, l_3)$$

with factor

$$\begin{aligned}
 3f_3(2)(l_3|l_0, l_1, l_2) &:= 6(\Delta(l_0, l_1, l_3) \wedge \Delta(l_0, l_2, l_3) - \\
 &\quad - \Delta(l_1, l_0, l_3) \wedge \Delta(l_1, l_2, l_3) + \Delta(l_2, l_0, l_3) \wedge \Delta(l_2, l_1, l_3)) \square
 \end{aligned}$$

Set $\mathcal{D}_{v,2} = \{g \in G \mid gv = \lambda v \text{ for some } \lambda \in F^*\}$. We have canonical invertible function $\lambda(g) := \frac{gv}{v}$ on $\mathcal{D}_{v,2}$. Put $m_4(g) := 6 \cdot \lambda(g)$.

Lemma 5.4. $s^* m_4 + \partial_2 m_3 = 0$; $\partial_3 m_4 = 0$.

Proof. In complete analogy with the previous one. \square

So we have constructed the cocycle $(m_0(g_1, \dots, g_5), \dots, m_4(g))$ representing a class $c_3 \in H_{\mathcal{M}}^6(BGL_3(F)_{\bullet}, \mathbb{Z}(3))$. In the next section for any complex algebraic manifold X a regulator

$$r_3 : H_{\mathcal{M}}^{\bullet}(X, \mathbb{Z}(3)) \longrightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^{\bullet}(X, \mathbb{R}(3))$$

will be constructed. We will apply it to c_3 .

3. Explicit construction of the regulator r_3 . Recall that a (real-valued) p -current on X is by definition a linear continuous functional on the space of $(\dim_R X - p)$ -forms with compact support. Let us denote by \mathcal{A}_X^p the space of all p -currents on X . There is a differential $d : \mathcal{A}_X^p \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}_X^{p+1}$, and the de Rham complex $(\mathcal{A}_X^{\bullet}, d)$ is a resolution of the constant sheaf \mathbb{R} .

The third Deligne complex $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(3)_X$ can be defined as a total complex associated with the following bicomplex (see [B3]):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{A}_X^0 & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{A}_X^1 & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{A}_X^2 & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{A}_X^3 & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{A}_X^4 & \xrightarrow{d} & \dots \\ & & & & & & \uparrow Re & & \uparrow -Re & & \\ & & & & & & \Omega_X^3 & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \Omega_X^4 & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \dots \end{array}$$

Here \mathcal{A}_X^0 placed in degree 1 and $(\Omega_X^{\bullet}, \partial)$ is the de Rham complex of holomorphic forms with logarithmic singularities at infinity.

The Deligne complex $\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(n)_X$ is defined as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbb{R}}(n)_X := \text{Cone}(\Omega_X^{\geq n} \xrightarrow{\alpha_n} \mathcal{A}_X^{\bullet})[-1]$$

where $\alpha_n = (-1)^{n-1} \cdot Re$ for odd n and $(-1)^n Im$ for even.

To compute $H^*(X, \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(n)_X)$ we will use the Dolbeaux resolution $(\mathcal{D}_X^{\geq p, q})$ for the complex of sheaves $(\Omega_X^{\geq n}, \partial)$ where $\mathcal{D}_X^{p, q}$ is the space of complex-valued (p, q) -currents.

Example 5.5 $\frac{dz}{z} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^{1,0}$ and $\bar{\partial}\left(\frac{dz}{z}\right) = 2\pi i \delta(0) dz \bar{d}z$. So $\bar{\partial} d \log f = 2\pi i \delta(f) df \bar{d}f$ for $f \in \mathcal{O}_X$.

Example 5.6 $d \arg f \in \mathcal{A}_X^1$ and $d(d \arg f) = 2\pi i \delta(f) df \bar{d}f$ for $f \in \mathcal{O}_X$.

In order to produce the regulator r_3 we will construct maps (that are not homomorphisms of complexes, see however proposition 5.7 below)

$$s_n : \Gamma(\text{Spec} \mathbb{C}(X); n) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(n)_X \quad (n \leq 3).$$

Namely, the map $s_3(\cdot)$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{B}_3(\mathbb{C}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}_2(\mathbb{C}(X)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(X)^* & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}(X)^* & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow s_3(1) & & \downarrow s_3(2) & & \downarrow s_3(3) \oplus d \log \wedge d \log \wedge d \log & & \\ \mathcal{A}_X^0 & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathcal{A}_X^1 & \xrightarrow{(d, 0)} & \mathcal{A}_X^2 \oplus \Omega_X^3 & \longrightarrow & \dots \end{array} \quad (5.6)$$

is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_3(1) &: \{f(x)\}_3 \mapsto \mathcal{L}_3(f(x)) \\
s_3(2) &: \{f(x)\}_2 \otimes g(x) \mapsto -\mathcal{L}_2(f(x))d \arg g(x) + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{3} \log |g(x)| \cdot (\log |1 - f(x)|d \log |f(x)| - \log |f(x)|d \log |1 - f(x)|) \\
s_3(3) &: f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge f_3 \mapsto \text{Alt} \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \log |f_1|d \arg f_2 \wedge d \arg f_3 - \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{6} \cdot |f_1|d \log |f_2|d \log |f_3| \right) \in \mathcal{A}_X^2; \\
d \log \wedge d \log \wedge d \log &: f_1 \wedge f_2 \wedge f_3 \mapsto d \log f_1 \wedge d \log f_2 \wedge d \log f_3 \in \Omega_X^3[A]
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.7 *Then maps $s_3(\cdot)$ define a homomorphism of complexes*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathcal{B}_3(\mathbb{C}(X)) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_2(\mathbb{C}(X)) \otimes \mathbb{C}(X)^* & \longrightarrow & \wedge^3 \mathbb{C}(X)^* \\
\downarrow s_3(1) & & \downarrow s_3(2) & & \downarrow s_3(3) \\
S_{\eta(X)}^0 & \xrightarrow{d} & S_{\eta(X)}^1 & \xrightarrow{d} & S_{\eta(X)}^2
\end{array} \tag{5.7}$$

where $S_{\eta(X)}^p$ is the space of p -forms at the generic point $\eta(X)$ of X .

Proof. Direct calculation using (1.14). □

This proposition means that $s_3(\cdot)$ is a homomorphism of complexes modulo currents supported on subvarieties of nonzero codimension of X .

The map

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{B}_2(\mathbb{C}(X)) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \wedge^2 \mathbb{C}(X)^* \\
\downarrow s_2(1) & & \downarrow s_2(2) \oplus d \log \wedge d \log \\
\mathcal{A}_X^0 & \xrightarrow{(d, 0)} & \mathcal{A}_X^1 \oplus \Omega_X^2
\end{array} \tag{5.8}$$

is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
s_2(1) &: \{f(x)\}_2 \mapsto \mathcal{L}_2(f(x)) \\
s_2(2) &: f \wedge g \mapsto -\log |f|d \arg g + \log |g|d \arg f \in \mathcal{A}_X^1.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, $s_1 : f(x) \mapsto [\log |f(x)|, -\frac{df}{f}] \in \mathcal{A}_X^0 \oplus \Omega_X^1$.

If $i : Y \hookrightarrow X$ is a complex algebraic subvariety of codimension d then there is a canonical homomorphism of complexes

$$i_* : \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(m)_Y \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(m+d)_X[2d]$$

provided by natural maps $i_* : \mathcal{D}_Y^{p,q} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_X^{p+d,q+d}$. Therefore there is a collection of maps

$$i_* \circ s_{n-d} : \prod_{x \in X^{(d)}} \Gamma(\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{C}(X), n-d) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(n)_X[2d]. \quad (9)$$

Recall that by definition $\Gamma(X, 3)$ is the total complex associated with the following bicomplex

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{C}(X), 3) &\xrightarrow{\partial_1} \prod_{x \in X^{(1)}} \Gamma(\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{C}(x), 2)[-1] \xrightarrow{\partial_2} \prod_{x \in X^{(2)}} \mathbb{C}(x)^*[-2] \\ &\xrightarrow{\partial_3} \prod_{x \in X^{(3)}} \mathbb{Z}[-3]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

So applying (5.9) to this complex we get the desired map

$$r_3 : \Gamma(X, 3) \longrightarrow \tilde{\mathbb{R}}(3)_X. \quad (11)$$

Theorem 5.8 (5.11) *is a homomorphism of complexes.*

Proof. Follows immediately from the construction and proposition 5.7 together with analogous claim for s_2 and examples (5.5), (5.6). \square

Remark 5.9 We can define regulators $r_n : \Gamma(X, n) \longrightarrow \tilde{R}(n)_X$ in complete analogy with this definition of r_3 . The only thing that we need is an explicit formula for $s_n(\cdot)$. See [G3] for details and formulas.

4. Formula for a cocycle representing $c_3 \in H_D^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet, R(3))$. Let v be a non-zero vector in a 3-dimensional vector space V^3 , $G = GL(V^3)$. Cocycle $c_3^{(v)}$ we have to construct will depend on v and look as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} (f_{(v)}^4, w_{(v)}^{3,2}) & \xrightarrow{s^*} & & & & & \\ & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & & & & \\ (f_{(v)}^3, w_{(v)}^{3,1}) & \xrightarrow{s^*} & & & & & \\ & \uparrow \bar{\partial} & & & & & \\ (f_{(v)}^2, w_{(v)}^{3,0}) & \xrightarrow{s^*} & & & & & \\ & \uparrow d & & & & & \\ f_{(v)}^1 & \xrightarrow{s^*} & & & & & \\ & \uparrow d & & & & & \\ f_{(v)}^0 & \xrightarrow{s^*} & 0 & & & & \end{array} \quad (5.12)$$

$$pt \longleftarrow G^1 \longleftarrow G^2 \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow G^3 \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow G^4 \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow G^5 \longleftarrow \cdots$$

Set (see (5.4), (5.6)):

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{(v)}^0(g_1, \dots, g_5) &:= \mathcal{L}_3(m_{(v)}^0(g_1, \dots, g_5)) := \mathcal{L}_3(r_3(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_5 v)) \\
f_{(v)}^1(g_1, \dots, g_4) &:= s_3(2)(m_{(v)}^1(g_1, \dots, g_4)) \\
f_{(v)}^2(g_1, g_2, g_3) &:= s_3(3)(m_{(v)}^2(g_1, g_2, g_3)) \\
w_{(v)}^{(3,0)}(g_1, g_2, g_3) &:= d \log \wedge d \log \wedge d \log(m_{(v)}^2(g_1, g_2, g_3)) \\
f_{(v)}^3(g_1, g_2) &:= i_{1*} s_2(2)(m_{(v)}^3(g_1, g_2)) \\
w_{(v)}^{3,1}(g_1, g_2) &:= i_{1*} d \log \wedge d \log(m_{(v)}^3(g_1, g_2)) \\
f_{(v)}^4(g) &:= i_{2*}(-\log |m_{(v)}^4(g)|) \\
w_{(v)}^{3,2}(g) &:= i_{2*} d \log(m_{(v)}^4(g))
\end{aligned}$$

Here $i_1 : \mathcal{D}_{v,1} \hookrightarrow G \times G$, $i_2 : \mathcal{D}_{v,2} \hookrightarrow G$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
i_{1*} &: \Omega_{\mathcal{D}_{v,1}}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G \times G}^{3,1}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}_{v,1}}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{G \times G}^3 \\
i_{2*} &: \Omega_{\mathcal{D}_{v,2}}^1 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G^{3,2}, \quad \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{D}_{v,2}}^0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_G^4.
\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 5.10 a) $c_3^{(v)}$ is a cocycle.

b) It represents a nontrivial nondecomposable class in $H_{\mathcal{D}}^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_{\bullet}, R(3))$.

c) This class lies in

$$Im(H_{\mathcal{D}}^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_{\bullet}, \mathbb{Q}(3)) \longrightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_{\bullet}, R(3)))$$

Proof. a) follows from theorem 5.2, lemmas 5.3 – 5.4 and theorem 5.8.

b) Let $\pi : EG_{\bullet} \longrightarrow BG_{\bullet}$ is the universal G -bundle realized as in (5.3). Then $EG_{(p)} = BG_{(p+1)}$ and so any i -cochain $c_{(\bullet)}$ for BG_{\bullet} defines an $(i-1)$ -cochain $\tilde{c}_{(\bullet)}$ for EG_{\bullet} : $\tilde{c}_{(p)} := c_{(p+1)}$. Moreover, if $c_{(0)} = 0$ and $c_{(\bullet)}$ is a cocycle then $d\tilde{c}_{(\bullet)} = c_{(\bullet)}$. Therefore $c_{(1)} = \tilde{c}|_G$ is the transgression of the cocycle $c_{(\bullet)}$.

Applying this to the constructed above cocycle $c_3^{(v)}$ we get a cocycle

$$(f_{(v)}^4, w_{(v)}^{3,2}) \in H_{\mathcal{D}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), R(3))$$

The usual exact sequence for Deligne cohomology gives us

$$\dots \longrightarrow H_{\mathcal{D}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{R}(3)) \xrightarrow{\alpha} H^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), R(3)) \cap H^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \Omega^{\geq 3}) \longrightarrow \dots$$

By definition

$$\alpha(f_{(v)}^4, w_{(v)}^{3,2}) = w_{(v)}^{3,2} \in \mathcal{D}^{3,2}(GL_3(\mathbb{C}))$$

Now let us check that the cohomology class defined by $w_{(v)}^{3,2}$ is non-zero and belongs to

$$H^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Q}(3)) \cap H^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \Omega^{\geq 3})$$

There is the standard map

$$\begin{aligned}
p_v : GL_3(\mathbb{C}) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^3 \setminus 0 \\
g &\longrightarrow gv
\end{aligned}$$

A vector v defines a canonical invertible function on the line $(\mathbb{C}^* \cdot v) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \setminus 0$, namely, $\tilde{m}_4(\lambda \cdot v) := \lambda$. So there is a $(3, 2)$ -current $\tilde{w}_{(v)}^{3,2}$ represented by 1-form $(2\pi i)^2 d \log \tilde{m}_4$ on the line generated by v . By definition

$$w_{(v)}^{3,2} = p_v^* \tilde{w}_{(v)}^{3,2}$$

On the other hand, let u be the canonical class in $H_B^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z})$. (It is dual to the homology class defined by 5-sphere in $\mathbb{C}^3 \setminus 0$.)

It is easy to see that $\tilde{w}_{(v)}^{3,2}$ represents class $(2\pi i)^3 u$.

So the class defined by $w_{(v)}^{3,2}$ coincides with canonical generator in $H_B^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}(3))$. Theorem 5.10 is proved.

Theorem 5.11. *The 5-cocycle $\mathcal{L}_3(r_3(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_5 v))$ defines a class in $H_{\text{cts}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), R(2))$ that coincides with a non-zero rational multiple of the Borel class*

Proof. Let G^δ be the Lie group made discrete. The morphism of groups $GL_3(\mathbb{C})^\delta \rightarrow GL_3(\mathbb{C})$ provides a morphism

$$e : BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet^\delta \rightarrow BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet .$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} e^* : H_D^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet, R(3)) &\rightarrow H_D^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet^\delta, R(3)) = \\ &= H^5(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet, S^0) \equiv H_{\text{cts}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), R(2)) \end{aligned}$$

(S^0 is the sheaf of C^∞ -functions). It is known that e^* maps the indecomposable class in $H_D^6(BGL_3(\mathbb{C})_\bullet, \mathbb{Z}(3))$ just to a non zero rational of the Borel class in $H_{\text{cts}}^5(GL_3(\mathbb{C}), R(2))$. (This is a particular case of the Beilinson's theorem comparing his regulator with the Borel one, see [B3] or [RSS]). In our case $e^*(c_3^{(v)}) = \mathcal{L}_3(r_3(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_5 v))$ by construction. \square

5. Possible generalizations. Recall that $(T_*(n), \partial)$ is the total complex associated with the Grassmanian bicomplex (3.18) and $T_{n+1}(n) = C_{n+1}(n)$.

Optimistic Conjecture 5.12. *There exists a homomorphism of complexes $\psi_*(n)$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \xrightarrow{\partial} & T_{2n}(n) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \dots & \longrightarrow & T_{n+2}(n) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & T_{n+1}(n) \\ & \downarrow \psi_{2n}(n) & & & & \downarrow \psi_{n+2}(n) & & \downarrow \psi_{n+1}(n) \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{B}_n(F) & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \mathcal{B}_2(F) \otimes \wedge^{n-2} F^* & \xrightarrow{\delta} & \wedge^n F^* \end{array}$$

such that

$$\psi_{n+1}(n) : (l_0, \dots, l_n) \in C_{n+1}(n) \mapsto \text{Alt } \wedge_{i=1}^n \Delta(l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_n) \in \wedge^n F^* .$$

This conjecture together with formulas for $\psi_*(n)$ would imply all explicit formulas for characteristic classes that I can imagine. Let me illustrate this by the following examples.

Corollary 5.13. *Conjecture 5.12 implies a construction of the Chern classes*

$$C_{i,n} : K_{2n-i}^{[n-i]}(F)_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow H^i(\Gamma_F(n)_{\mathbb{Q}})$$

(I use the rank filtration instead of the Adams one).

Proof. See s. 7,10 in §3. \square

Corollary 5.14. *Zagier's conjecture about $\zeta_F(n)$ follows from conjecture 5.12.*

Proof. The function $P_n := \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n \circ \psi_{2n}(n)$ on $C_{2n}(n)$

$$P_n : (l_0, \dots, l_{2n-1}) \xrightarrow{\psi_{2n}(n)} \mathcal{B}_n(\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_n} R$$

satisfies the functional equations

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2n} (-1)^i P_n(l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_{2n}) = 0 \quad \forall (l_0, \dots, l_{2n}) \in C_{2n+1}(n)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{2n} (-1)^i P_n(l_i | l_0, \dots, \hat{l}_i, \dots, l_{2n}) = 0 \quad \forall (l_0, \dots, l_{2n}) \in C_{2n+1}(n+1).$$

Therefore for a nonzero vector $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ the function $P_n(v, g_1 v, \dots, g_{2n} v)$ is a measurable $(2n-1)$ -cocycle of $GL_n(\mathbb{C})$. The formula for homomorphism $\psi_{(n+1)}(n)$ together with Conjecture 5.12 would imply that the cohomology class of this cocycle is a non-zero rational multiple of the Borel class. In fact using the main result of [DHZ] one can see that it coincides with the Borel class. This, together with Borel's theorem 2.3, would then prove Zagier's conjecture. For $n=3$ this was explained in s. 7, 10 in §3 and §5. See [G4] for general case and a construction of a cocycle representing the Borel class in $H_{cts}^{2n-1}(GL_N(\mathbb{C}), R(n-1))$ to $N > n$. □ Formulas for $\psi_*(n)$ provide an explicit construction of the universal Chern class $c_n \in H_{\mathcal{M}}^{2n}(BGL_N(F)_\bullet, \mathbb{Q}(n))$, ($N \geq n$), together with their realization in Deligne cohomology. In particular we will get an explicit construction of the Chern classes of vector bundles with values in motivic cohomology (see [G4]). I would like to emphasize that all this is closely related to the work of Gabrielov, Gelfand and Losik about combinatorial formula for the first Pontryagin class ([GGL], [You]).

The Grassmanian complex $(C_*(n), d)$ is a subcomplex in $(T_*(n), \partial)$. Therefore homomorphism $\psi_*(n)$ provides a formula for the Grassmanian n -cocycle in Deligne cohomology conjectured in [BMS], [HM].

It is interesting that for applications (to characteristic classes for instance) it is *not* sufficient to have such formulas for the Grassmanian complex only: we have to extend them to the whole Grassmanian *bicomplex*. This problem becomes nontrivial already for $n=4$.

Another important application of formulas for $\psi_*(n)$ is a very explicit construction using the classical polylogarithms for Beilinson's regulator for curves and, moreover, arbitrary regular schemes X . Together with Beilinson's conjecture about regulators this will give us an (hypothetical) explicit formula for $\zeta_X(n)$. Note that such formulas can be written without mentioning conjecture 5.11, see [G3].

I am sure that homomorphism $\psi_*(n)$ exist for any n . It is canonical for $n < 4$ and in this case formulas for $\psi_*(n)$ were written in [G2]. I still hope that there exist nice formulas for all n (that is why I call conjecture 5.12 "optimistic"). But I have no idea whether there should be canonical in some sense homomorphisms for $n \geq 4$. This is related very much to the discussion in the last section of §4. Today I know an explicit formula (for arbitrary n) for $\psi_{n+2}(n)$ and $\psi_{n+1}(n)$ only. (Formulas for $\psi_{n+2}(n)$ can be found in the proof of proposition 3.3 in [G4]). I think that computation of $\psi_*(n)$ should be a very interesting problem. Theorem 4.7 indicates that new phenomena could appear for $n \geq 4$. The case $n=4$ is crucial for understanding of conjecture 5.12 and should be quite different from $n=2, 3$.

REFERENCES

- [B1] Beilinson A.A.: *Height pairings between algebraic cycles*, Lecture Notes in Math. N. 1289, (1987), p. 1–26.
- [B2] Beilinson A.A.: *Polylogarithms and cyclotomic elements*, preprint 1989.
- [B3] Beilinson A.A.: *Higher regulators and values of L-functions*, VINITI, 24 (1984), 181–238 (in Russian); English translation: J. Soviet Math. 30 (1985), 2036–2070.
- [B–D] Beilinson A.A., Deligne P.: *Polylogarithms and regulators*. This volume.
- [BMSch] Beilinson A.A., MacPherson R., Schechtman, V.V.: *Notes on motivic cohomology*, Duke Math. J. 54 (1987), 679–710.
- [BGSV] Beilinson A.A., Goncharov A.B., Schechtman V.V, Varchenko A.N.: *Projective geometry and algebraic K-theory*. Algebra and Analysis 1990 N 3 p. 78–131 (in Russian). Translated to English by A.M.S.
- [Bl1] Bloch S.: *Higher regulators, algebraic K- theory and zeta functions of elliptic curves*, Lect. Notes U.C. Irvine, 1977.
- [Bl2] Bloch S.: *Application of the dilogarithm function in algebraic K-theory and algebraic geometry*. Proc. Int. Symp. Alg. Geometry, Kyoto (1977), 1–14.
- [Bo1] Borel A.: *Cohomologie des espaces fibrés principaux*, Ann. Math. 57 (1953), 115–207.
- [Bo2] Borel A.: *Cohomologie de SL_n et valeurs de fonctions zêta aux points entiers*. Annali Scuola Normale Superiore Pisa 4 (1977), 613–636.
- [D1] Deligne P.: *Le groupe fondamental de la droite projective moins trois points*, in “Galois groups over \mathbb{Q} ”, Y. Ihara, K. Ribet, J.-P. Serre ed., Publ.MSRI vol 16, p. 80–290, 1989.
- [D2] Deligne P.: *Interprétation motivique de la conjecture de Zagier reliant polylogarithmes et régulateurs*. Preprint 1990.
- [Du1] Dupont J.: *The dilogarithm as a characteristic class for a flat bundles*, J. Pure and Appl. Algebra, 44 (1987), 137–164.
- [DS] Dupont J., Sah C.-H.: *Scissors congruences II*, J. Pure and Appl. Algebra, v. 25, 1982, p. 159–195.
- [DHZ] Dupont J., Hain R., Zucker S.,
- [GGL] Gabriellov A.M., Gelfand I.M., Losic M.V.: *Combinatorial computation of characteristic classes*, Funct. Analysis and its Applications V. 9 No. 2 (1975) p. 103–115 and v3 (1975) p. 5–26 (in Russian).
- [GM] Gelfand I.M., MacPherson R.: *Geometry in Grassmannians and a generalisation of the dilogarithm*, Advances in Math., 44 (1982) 279–312.
- [G1] Goncharov A.B.: *The classical trilogarithm, algebraic K-theory of fields, and Dedekind zeta-functions*. Bull. of the AMS, v. 29, N1 (1991), p. 155–161.
- [G2] Goncharov A.B.: *Geometry of configurations, polylogarithms and motivic cohomology*. Preprint of the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik, 1991. To appear in Advances in Mathematics.
- [G3] Goncharov A.B., *Explicit formulas for regulators*, (in preparation).
- [G4] Goncharov A.B., *Explicit construction of characteristic classes*. Preprint of the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik, 1992.
- [Gu] Guichardet A.: *Cohomologie des groupes topologiques et des algèbres de Lie*, Nathan (1980).
- [Gil] Gillet H.: *Riemann-Roch Theorem in Higher K-Theory*, Advances in Math., 40, 1981, 203–289.

- [H.-M] Hain R, MacPherson R.: *Higher Logarithms*, Illinois J. of Mathematics, vol. 34, N2, p. 392–475.
- [K] Kummer E.E.: *Über die Transcendenten, welche aus wiederholten Integrationen rationaler Formeln entstehen*, J. reine ang. Math. 21 (1840), pp. 74–90, 193–225, 328–371 (= C.P., vol.11, N 15).
- [L] Lewin L.: *Dilogarithms and associated functions*. North Holland, 1981.
- [Le] *Structural Properties of Polylogarithms*, edited by L.Lewin, AMS series of Mathematical surveys and monographs, 1991.
- [Lei] Gerhardt C.I. (ed). G.W.Leibniz Mathematisch Schriften III/1 pp. 336-339 Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim. New York 1971.
- [L1] Lichtenbaum S.: *Values of zeta functions at non-negative integers*, Journées Arithmétiques, Noordwijkerhovt, Netherlands, Springer Verlag, 1983.
- [L2] Lichtenbaum S.: *The construction of weight two arithmetic cohomology*. Inventiones Math. 88 (1987), 183–215.
- [Ma] Matsumoto H.: *Sur les sous-groupes arithmétiques des groupes semi-simples déployés*. Ann.Sci.Ec.Norm.Sup.,2,(1969), 1-62.
- [Mo] Moore C.: *Group extensions of p-adic and adelic linear groups*. Publ.Math.I.H.E.S. 35 (1969),5-74
- [M] MacPherson R.: *The combinatorial formula of Gabrielov, Gelfand and Losik for the first Pontriagin class*, Sémin. Bourbaki 497, Fev. 1977. Springer Lect. Notes in Math. 677.
- [M2] Milnor J.: *Algebraic K-theory and quadratic forms*, Invent. Math. 9 (1970), 318–340.
- [MM] Milnor J., Moore J.: *On the structure of Hopf algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) 81 (1965) 211–264.
- [MS] Mercuriev A.S., Suslin A.A.: *On the K_3 of a field*, LOMI preprint, Leningrad, 1987.
- [NS] Nesterenko Yu. P., Suslin A.A.: *Homology of the full linear group over a local ring and Milnor K-theory*, Izvestiya Ac. Sci. USSR, vol. 553 (1989) N1, 121–146 (in Russian).
- [Q1] Quillen D.: *Higher algebraic K-theory I*, Lect. Notes in Math. 341 (1973), 85–197.
- [RSS] Rapoport M., Schappacher N., Schneider M.: *Beilinson's conjectures on values of L-functions*, Prog. in Math. 1989.
- [S] Spence W.: *An Essay on Logarithmic Transcendents*, pp. 26–34, London and Edinburgh, 1809.
- [Sa] Sah C.-H.: *Homology of classical groups made discrete III*, J. of Pure and Appl. Algebra (1989).
- [So] Soulé C.: *Opérations en K-théorie Algébrique*, Canad. J. Math. 27 (1985), 488–550.
- [S1] Suslin A.A.: *Homology of GL_n , characteristic classes and Milnor's K-theory*. Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics 1985, Issue 3, 207– 226 and Springer Lecture Notes in Math. 1046 (1989), 357–375.
- [S2] Suslin A.A.: *Algebraic K-theory of fields*. Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Berkeley, California, USA, 1986, 222–243.
- [S3] Suslin A.A.: *K_3 of a field and Bloch's group*, Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics 1991, Issue 4.

- [V-E] Van Est W.T. *Group cohomology and Lie algebra cohomology in Lie groups*, Indagationes Math., 15, 484-504 (1953).
- [Y1] Yang, J.: *On the real cohomology of arithmetic groups and the rank conjecture for number fields*. Preprint 1990.
- [Y2] Yang, J.: *The Hain-Macpherson's trilogarithm, the Borel regulators and the value of Dedekind zeta function at 3*. In preparation.
- [You] Youssin B.V.: *Sur les formes $S^{p,q}$ apparaissant dans le calcul combinatoire de la deuxième classe de Pontrjagine par la méthode de Gabrielov, Gelfand, et Losik*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser I, Math. 292 (1981), 641– 649.
- [Z1] Zagier D.: *Polylogarithms, Dedekind zeta functions and the algebraic K-theory of fields*. Arithmetic Algebraic Geometry (G.v.d.Geer, F.Oort, J.Steenbrink, eds.), Prog. Math., Vol 89, Birkhauser, Boston, 1991, pp. 391–430. Proceedings of the Texel conference on Arithmetical Algebraic Geometry, 1990 (to appear).
- [Z2] Zagier D.: *Hyperbolic manifolds and special values of Dedekind zeta functions*, Inventiones Math. 83 (1986), 285–301.