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Abstract. In this monograph we study three fundamental questions about 1-periods and give complete answers. These complex numbers are the values of integrals of rational algebraic 1-forms over not necessarily closed paths, or equivalently periods in cohomological degree 1, or of Deligne 1-motives over \(\mathbb{Q}\).

(1) We give a necessary and sufficient condition for a period integral to be transcendental. We make this result explicit in the case of the Weierstrass \(\sigma\)-function on an elliptic curve.

(2) We give a qualitative description of all \(\mathbb{Q}\)-linear relations between 1-periods. This establishes Kontsevich’s version of the period conjecture for such periods.

(3) For a fixed 1-motive, we derive a general formula for the dimension of the space of its periods in the spirit of Baker’s theorem, which appears as a very special case.

These long-standing open questions lie in the heart of modern transcendence theory. They look back to a long history starting with the transcendence of \(\pi\).
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CHAPTER 0

Introduction

In this introduction we explain the main results of our monograph and their historical context. The presentation does not follow the order in the paper, but, hopefully, the interest for readers without a background in transcendence.

0.1. Transcendence

The $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-vector space $\mathcal{P}^1$ of one-dimensional periods has a number of different descriptions. Here is the most elementary one: its elements are complex numbers of the form

$$\alpha = \int_{\sigma} \omega$$

where

- $X$ is a smooth projective curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$;
- $\omega$ is a rational differential form on $X$;
- $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \gamma_i$ is a chain in the Riemann surface $X^{an}$ defined by $X$ which avoids the singularities of $\omega$ and has boundary divisor $\partial \sigma$ in $X(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$; in particular $\gamma_i : [0,1] \to X^{an}$ is a path and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

This set includes many interesting numbers like $2\pi i$, $\log(\alpha)$ for algebraic $\alpha$ and the periods of elliptic curves over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

0.1.1. Historical background. The study of transcendence properties of periods has a long history. It begins in 1882 with the famous theorem of Lindemann on the transcendence of $\pi$. He showed that $\pi$ is transcendental. Shortly after, in his famous address at the ICM 1900, Hilbert asked in his 7th out of 23 problems whether $\alpha, \beta$ and $\gamma = \alpha^\beta$ can be algebraic numbers simultaneously. There are some obvious cases: $\alpha = 0$, $\alpha = 1$ or $\gamma$ rational. Is this the complete list? He considered this problem as more difficult to prove than the Riemann hypothesis.

To much surprise Gelfond and Schneider succeeded in 1934 independently to answer Hilbert’s problem. In particular, $\log(\alpha)$ is transcendental for algebraic $\alpha \neq 0, 1$.

The study of elliptic periods was initiated by a paper of Siegel in 1932, see [Siegel 1932]. He showed that the periods of the Weierstrass elliptic function with algebraic invariants, which are periods of an elliptic integral of the first kind, cannot be all algebraic. In the case of Weierstrass elliptic functions with complex multiplication this means they are all transcendental. In the
non-CM case, this was then shown by Schneider using his methods developed for the case of logarithms, see [Sch35b, Sch35a].

The case of complete periods in the general case, i.e., \( X \) and \( \omega \) arbitrary, \( \gamma \) closed, was settled in 1986 by the second author in [Wüs87]: If a period is non-zero, it is transcendental. Both cases can arise. A simple example is a hyperelliptic curve whose Jacobian is isogenous to a product of two elliptic curves. Then 8 of the 16 periods are 0. The others are transcendental.

0.1.2. New results. What about incomplete periods? Often the values are transcendental, e.g. \( \int_{1}^{2} \frac{dz}{z} = \log(2) \) but certainly not always, e.g., \( \int_{0}^{2} dz = 2 \). Again, it is not difficult to write down a list of simple cases in which the period is a non-zero algebraic number. However, it was not at all clear whether the list was complete and what the structure behind the examples was, see [Wüs12]. The answer that we give now is surprisingly simple:

**Theorem 0.1 (See Theorem 7.10).** Let \( \alpha = \int_{\sigma} \omega \) be a one-dimensional period on \( X \). Then \( \alpha \) is algebraic if and only if
\[
\omega = df + \omega' \quad \text{with} \quad f \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(X)^* \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\sigma} \omega' = 0.
\]

The condition is clearly sufficient because the integral evaluates to
\[
\sum_{i} a_i (f(\gamma_i(1)) - f(\gamma_i(0))) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}
\]
in this case.

Theorem 7.10 gives a complete answer to two of the seven problems listed in Schneider’s book [Sch57, p. 138], open for more than 60 years. Actually we even include periods of abelian integrals of the third kind.

0.2. Relations between periods

Questions on transcendence can be viewed as a very special case of the question on \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-linear relations between 1-periods: a complex number is transcendental if it is \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-linearly independent of 1.

0.2.1. Historical background: linear relations. The Theorem of Gelfond and Schneider mentioned above treats the case of linear dependence of \( \log(\alpha) \) and \( \log(\gamma) \) for algebraic \( \alpha, \gamma \).

Schneider further developed the theory also to deal with elliptic integrals of the first and second kind. He showed for example that if \( u \) is chosen such that the Weierstrass \( \wp \)-function takes an algebraic value, then 1, \( u \) and \( \zeta(u) \)

---

1 Problem 3. Es ist zu versuchen, Transzendentenzresultate über elliptische Integrale dritter Gattung zu beweisen.

2 Problem 4. Die Transzendentenzsätze über elliptische Integrale erster und zweiter Gattung sind in weitestmöglichs ultr auf analoge Sätze über abelsche Integrale zu verallgemeinern.
are linearly independent over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). In particular if \( \omega \) is in the period lattice then 1, \( \omega \) and \( \eta(\omega) \) are linearly independent over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). He left it as an open problem to prove similar results also for elliptic integrals of the third kind.

The methods that had been developed so far did not apply to deal with more than two logarithms and it was considered a very difficult problem to make progress. This hurdle was taken in the case of classical logarithms in 1966 by Baker. He showed that if \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) are non-zero algebraic numbers, then a linear form with algebraic coefficients in \( \log(\alpha_1), \ldots, \log(\alpha_n) \) vanishes if and only if the logarithms are linearly dependent over \( \mathbb{Q} \).

At the same time there was intensive work by Baker, Coates and Masser also for elliptic logarithms. General linear combinations of elliptic or abelian logarithms were settled by the second author, see [BW07] Chapter 6.2.

0.2.2. Historical background: the period conjecture. A conceptual interpretation of the relations between periods is provided by what came to be known as the period conjecture. Roughly: periods are given a cohomological interpretation and all relations between them should be induced by relations between motives.

This string of ideas was started by Grothendieck in [Gro66, p. 101]. He discusses the comparison of the de Rham cohomology of a smooth variety \( X \) over a number field \( K \) with its singular cohomology. The entries of the comparison matrix comparing \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(X) \) and \( H^1_{\text{sing}}(X^{an}, \mathbb{Q}) \) of a complete non-singular curve \( X \) are classical periods of the first and second kind. Grothendieck asks for instance if Schneider’s theorem generalises in some way to these periods. Subsequently, he came to a conceptual conjecture predicting the transcendence degree of the field of periods of \( H^n(X) \) for a smooth projective variety \( X \) (or more generally of a pure motive \( M \)) as the dimension of the motivic Galois group or the dimension of the Mumford-Tate group of the Hodge structure on \( M \).

However, he did not publish the conjecture himself. We refer to the first hand account of André in [And19] on the history of the conjecture. A complete formulation and discussion was finally given by André [And04, Chapter 23]. Its formulation for 1-motives is discussed by Bertolin in [Ber02] and more recently [Ber19]. The only known result in this direction is a theorem of Chudnovsky, who showed that for any elliptic curve defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) at least two of the numbers \( \omega_1, \omega_2, \eta(\omega_1) \) and \( \eta(\omega_2) \) are algebraically independent provided that \( \omega_1 \) and \( \omega_2 \) generate the period lattice over \( \mathbb{Q} \). In the case of complex multiplication this implies that \( \omega \) and \( \eta(\omega) \) are algebraically independent, which confirms the prediction in the CM case. In general Grothendieck’s conjecture is out of reach.

\[3\text{In footnote 10) Grothendieck recalls the belief that the periods } \omega_1, \omega_2 \text{ of a non-CM elliptic curve should be algebraically independent. “This conjecture extends in an obvious way to the set of periods } (\omega_1, \omega_2, \eta_1, \eta_2) \text{ and can be rephrased also for curves of any genus, or rather for abelian varieties of dimension } g, \text{ involving } 4g \text{ periods.”} \]
In a series of papers, Kontsevich and Zagier [KZ01, Kon99] promoted also the study of periods of non-smooth, non-projective varieties, or more generally of mixed motives. In [Kon99] Kontsevich formulates an alternative version of the period conjecture: periods are defined as the numbers in the image of the period pairing for relative cohomology

$$H^*_{\text{dR}}(X,Y) \times H^*_{\text{sing}}(X,Y; \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathbb{C}$$

for algebraic varieties $X$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and subvarieties $Y \subset X$. By Kontsevich’s period conjecture all $\mathbb{Q}$-linear relations between such periods should be induced by bilinearity and functoriality of mixed motives. More explicitly, he introduces an algebra of formal periods $\bar{P}$ with explicit generators and relations. His conjecture predicts that the evaluation map $\bar{P} \to \mathbb{C}$ (sending a formal period to the actual value of the integral) is injective.

Actually, Grothendieck’s period conjecture on algebraic relations between periods of pure motives is implied by Kontsevich’s period conjecture on linear relations of periods of mixed motives, see e.g. [HMS17, Section 13.2.1] or [Hub18, Section 5.3] for the precise relation.

**0.2.3. New results.** We establish a complete description of the linear relations between not necessarily complete periods for all rational differential forms of degree 1. It is crucial to use the more conceptual descriptions of $\mathcal{P}^1$ either as periods in cohomological degree 1 or as cohomological periods of curves, or even better periods of 1-motives.

**Theorem 0.2 (Kontsevich’s Period Conjecture for $\mathcal{P}^1$, Theorem 7.3).** All $\mathbb{Q}$-linear relations between elements of $\mathcal{P}^1$ are induced by bilinearity and functoriality of pairs $(C, D)$ where $C$ is a smooth affine curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $D \subset C$ a finite set of points over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

This establishes Kontsevich’s version of the period conjecture for $\mathcal{P}^1$. It has an alternative formulation in terms of motives. Actually, we deduce Theorem 0.2 from the motivic version below together with the result of Ayoub and Barbire-Viale in [ABV15] that the subcategory of $\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}$ generated by $H^*(C, D)$ with $C$ of dimension at most 1 agrees with Deligne’s much older category of 1-motives, see [Del74].

Every 1-motive $M$ has a singular realisation $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and a de Rham realisation $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$. They are linked via a period isomorphism

$$V_{\text{sing}}(M) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{C} \cong V_{\text{dR}}(M) \otimes_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \mathbb{C}.$$ 

The well-known relation between curves and 1-motives is provided by the theory of generalised Jacobians. The set $\mathcal{P}^1$ has another alternative description as the union of the images of the period pairings

$$V_{\text{sing}}(M) \times V_{\text{dR}}(M) \to \mathbb{C}$$

for all 1-motives $M$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. 
Theorem 0.3 (Period conjecture for 1-motives, Theorem 3.8). All \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear relations between elements of \( \mathcal{P}^1 \) are induced by bilinearity and functoriality for morphisms of iso-1-motives over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \).

0.3. Dimensions of period spaces

The above qualitative theorems can be refined into an explicit computation of the dimension \( \delta(M) \) of the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space generated by the periods of a given 1-motive \( M \). The result depends on the subtle and very unexpected interplay between the constituents of \( M \).

0.3.1. Historical background. The precedent for the kind of formula that we have in mind is Baker’s theorem, \( \text{[Bak67]} \). In one possible reformulation: for \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) let \( \langle \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \rangle \) be the multiplicative subgroup of \( \mathbb{Q}^* \) generated by these numbers. Then

\[
\text{rk}_\mathbb{Z} \langle \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \rangle = \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} (\log(\beta_1), \ldots, \log(\beta_n))/2\pi i \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.
\]

Besides Baker’s theorem, a number of cases have been considered so far; e.g. the case of elliptic logarithms, see \( \text{[BW07], Chapter 6.2]} \) or the extension of an elliptic curve by a torus of dimension \( n \) in \( \text{[Wü84]} \). An interesting new case came up recently in connection with curvature lines and geodesics for billiards on a triaxial ellipsoid, see \( \text{[Wü18]} \). This leads to a period space generated by \( 1, 2\pi i \) and the periods \( \omega_1, \omega_2, \eta(\omega_1), \eta(\omega_2), \lambda(u, \omega_1), \lambda(u, \omega_2) \) of the first, second and third kind. Its dimension over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) is 8, 6 or 4 depending on the endomorphisms of the elliptic curve involved and on the nature of the differential of the third kind. This case serves as a model for the completely general result below.

0.3.2. 1-motives. Not only for the proofs, but also for the very formulation of the dimension formulas, we rely on the theory of 1-motives introduced by Deligne, see \( \text{[Del74]} \). They form an abelian category that captures all cohomological properties of algebraic varieties in degree 1, including all one-dimensional periods.

We review the basics: a 1-motive over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) is a complex \( M = [L \to G] \) where \( G \) is a semi-abelian variety over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) and \( L \) a free abelian group of finite rank. The map is a group homomorphism. As mentioned before, every 1-motive has de Rham and singular realisations and a period isomorphism between them after extension of scalars to \( \mathbb{C} \).

If \( C \) is a smooth curve over \( k \), \( D \subset C \) a finite set of \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-points, then there is a 1-motive \( M(C) \) such that \( H^1_{\text{sing}}(\mathbb{C}^\text{an}, D; \mathbb{Q}) \) agrees with the singular realisation of \( M(C) \), and \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D) \) agrees with the de Rham realisation of \( M(C) \). Hence the period of the pair \( (C, D) \) agree with the periods of \( M(C) \). Explicitly, \( M(C) = [\mathbb{Z}[D] \to J(C)] \) where \( J(C) \) is the generalised Jacobian of \( C \) and \( \mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \) means divisor of degree 0 supported on \( D \).

We denote by \( \mathcal{P}(M) \) the image of the period pairing for \( M \) and by \( \mathcal{P}(M) \) the abelian group (or, equivalently \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-vector space) generated by \( \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathbb{C} \).
0.3.3. New results. We fix a 1-motive $M = [L \to G]$ with $G$ an extension of an abelian variety $A$ by a torus $T$ and $L$ a free abelian group of finite rank. For the definition of its singular realisation $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and its de Rham realisation $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$, we refer to Chapter 2.

The weight filtration on $M$, explicitly

$$[0 \to T] \subset [0 \to G] \subset [L \to G]$$

induces

$$V_{\text{sing}}(T) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(G) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(M).$$

and dually

$$V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L \to A]) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L \to 0]).$$

Together, they introduce a bifiltration on $\mathcal{P}(M)$:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{P}(T) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}(G) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}(M) \\
\downarrow \quad \downarrow \\
\mathcal{P}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}([L \to A]) \\
\downarrow \\
\mathcal{P}([L \to 0])
\end{array}$$

We introduce the notation and terminology

$\mathcal{P}_{\text{Tate}}(M) = \mathcal{P}(T)$ Tate periods

$\mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M) = \mathcal{P}(A)$ 2nd kind wrt closed paths

$\mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M) = \mathcal{P}([L \to 0])$ algebr. periods

$\mathcal{P}_{3}(M) = \mathcal{P}(G)/(\mathcal{P}_{\text{Tate}}(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M))$ 3rd kind wrt closed paths

$\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc2}}(M) = \mathcal{P}([L \to A])/(\mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M))$ 2nd kind wrt non-cl. paths

$\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \mathcal{P}(M)/(\mathcal{P}_{3}(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc2}}(M))$ 3rd kind wrt non-cl. paths

After choosing bases, they organise into a period matrix of the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\mathcal{P}_{\text{Tate}}(M) & \mathcal{P}_{3}(M) & \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M) \\
0 & \mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M) & \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc2}}(M) \\
0 & 0 & \mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M)
\end{pmatrix}
$$

The contribution of $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Tate}}(M)$ (multiples of $2\pi i$) and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M)$ (algebraic numbers) is readily understood. Note that the off-diagonal entries are only well-defined up to periods on the diagonal. This can also be seen in the case of Baker periods, which are contained in $\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ for special $M$. The value of $\log(\alpha)$ depends on the chosen path and is only well-defined up to multiples of $2\pi i$.

Theorem 9.2 gives a formula for the dimension of each of these spaces. The total dimension is obtained by adding up these dimensions. In particular, we have e.g.

$$\mathcal{P}([L \to A]) \cap \mathcal{P}([0 \to G]) = \mathcal{P}([0 \to A]).$$
The most interesting and hardest contribution is \( \mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M) \). In the special case \( A = 0 \), we get back Baker’s theorem. The computation of this contribution was not possible without the methods that we develop here. It should be added that the formula for the other contributions was not in the literature either.

The formula for \( \mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M) \) simplifies in the case of motives that we call saturated, see Definition 9.3. Fortunately, by Theorem 9.5 the periods of a general motive are always included in the period space of \( M_0 \times M_{sat} \) with \( M_0 \) of Baker type \( (A_0 = 0) \) and \( M_{sat} \) saturated.

The full result is somewhat lengthy to state. We refer to Theorem 9.2 for the formula. We also refer to Chapter 5 for the examples of elliptic curves without and with CM.

0.4. Method of proof

As in the case of closed paths, the main ingredient of our proof (and the only input from transcendence theory) is the Analytic Subgroup Theorem of \( \text{[Wûns89]} \). We give a reformulation as Theorem 1.2. Given a smooth connected commutative algebraic group over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) and \( u \in \text{Lie}(G_{an}) \) such that \( \exp_G(u) \in G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \). Then there is a short exact sequence

\[
0 \to G_1 \to G \xrightarrow{\pi} G_2 \to 0
\]

of algebraic groups over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) such that \( \text{Ann}(u) = \pi^* (\text{coLie}(G_2)) \) and \( u \in \text{Lie}(G_{an}) \). Here \( \text{Ann}(u) \subset \text{coLie}(G) \) is the largest subspace such that \( \langle \text{Ann}(u), u \rangle = 0 \) under the period pairing.

Given a 1-motive \( M \), Deligne constructed a vector extension \( M^\# \) of \( G \) such that \( V_{dR}M = \text{Lie}(M^\#) \). This is the group we apply the Subgroup Theorem to.

**Theorem 0.4 (Subgroup theorem for 1-motives, Theorem 3.6).** Given a 1-motive \( M \) over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) and \( u \in V_{\text{sing}}(M) \), there is a short exact sequence of 1-motives

\[
0 \to M_1 \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} M_2 \to 0
\]

such that \( \text{Ann}(u) = p^* V_{dR}(M_2) \) and \( u \in i_\ast V_{\text{sing}}(M_1) \). Here \( \text{Ann}(u) \subset V_{dR}(M) \) is the left kernel under the period pairing.

Any \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-linear relation between periods can be translated into the vanishing of a period. Then the Subgroup Theorem for 1-motives is applied.

As a byproduct, we also get a couple of new results on 1-motives over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \): they are a full subcategory of the category of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-Hodge structures over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) (see Proposition 2.8) and of the category of (non-effective) Nori motives (see Theorem 7.4) and of the category \( (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q}) \)-\text{Vect} of pairs of vector spaces together with a period matrix. The last statement was also obtained independently by André, Barrientos, and Bertapelle, see [ABVB18].

The case of Hodge structures has just recently been considered by André in...
He proves that the functor from motives into $\mathbb{Q}$-Hodge structures is fully faithful for all algebraically closed fields $k \subset \mathbb{C}$.

0.5. The case of elliptic curves

The above results are very general and depend on a subtle interplay between the data. It is a non-trivial task to make them explicit in particular examples. We have carried this out to some extent in the case of an elliptic curve $E$ defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Recall the Weierstrass $\wp$-, $\zeta$- and $\sigma$-function for $E$. We obtain:

**Theorem 0.5** (see Theorem 10.6). *Let $u \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $\wp(u) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\exp_E(u)$ is non-torsion in $E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. Then*

$$u\zeta(u) - 2\log\sigma(u)$$

*is transcendental.*

This is an incomplete period integral of the third kind. The proof of the above result actually is not a direct consequence of Theorem 0.1 but rather uses the insights of our dimension computations.

We also carry out the dimension computation in this case. Let $M = [L \to G]$ with $L \cong \mathbb{Z}$, $G$ an extension of $E$ by $\mathbb{G}_m$ that is non-split up to isogeny, $L_{\mathbb{Q}} \to E_{\mathbb{Q}}$ injective. Then by Proposition 5.1 and 5.2

$$\dim \mathcal{P}(M) = \begin{cases} 11, & E \mathrm{without\ CM}, \\ 9, & E \mathrm{CM}. \end{cases}$$

The incomplete periods of the third kind become more difficult already if we consider $M = [L \to G]$ with $L \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$, $G$ an extension of $E$ by $\mathbb{G}_m^2$, again $L_{\mathbb{Q}} \to E_{\mathbb{Q}}$ injective and $G$ completely non-split up to isogeny. If $E$ does not have CM, then

$$\dim \mathcal{P}(M) = 18.$$  

If $E$ is CM, then

$$\dim \mathcal{P}(M) = 16, 14, 12, 10$$

depending on the interplay of the complex multiplication and $L$ and $G$. The extreme case occurs when $\text{End}(M)$ is the CM-field. Then the resulting dimension is 10.

0.6. Structure of the monograph

We have tried to make the paper accessible to readers not familiar with either motives or periods.

We first address periods of 1-motives. After settling some notation, Chapter 2 starts by reviewing briefly Deligne’s category of 1-motives and its properties. We then establish auxiliary results that are needed in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 discusses periods of 1-motives and proves the version of the period conjecture purely in terms of 1-motives. We then consider examples:
in Chapter 4 we treat the classical cases like the transcendence of \( \pi \) and values of \( \log \) in our language. In Chapter 5 we apply the general results in the case of a 1-motive whose constituents are as small as possible without being trivial and compute the dimensions of their period spaces.

We then turn to periods of algebraic varieties. Chapter 6 clarifies the notion of a cohomological period. After defining \( P^1 \) in a down to earth way, the interpretation of cohomological periods as the periods of 1-motives is explained. We then turn to Nori motives and explain the story from the motivic point of view.

In Chapter 7 we use the results on periods of 1-motives to deduce the qualitative results on \( P^1 \) and periods of curves: the criterion on transcendence and the period conjecture. The results are made explicit in terms of differential forms of the first, second and third kind on an algebraic curve in Chapter 8.

The next topic is a dimension formula for the space of periods of a 1-motives in terms of its data. Chapter 9 is devoted to explicit dimension computations, which are very involved, in particular, for the case of \( P_{inc3} \). In this rather complicated case the results were unexpected.

In the final chapter 10 we deal with the case of elliptic curves and make our results explicit in terms of the classical Weierstrass functions \( \wp, \zeta, \sigma \). We also explain how transcendence results on special values of the hypergeometric function can be deduced.

There are four appendices: the first two sum up the results on the analytic subgroup theorem and generalised Jacobians in the form that we need. Appendix A also contains results on the comparison of the categories of commutative algebraic groups over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) and analytic groups that follow from the Analytic Subgroup theorem.

Appendix C presents Nori’s theory of motives to the extent used in the main text.

The last appendix is of technical nature: we need to verify that the singular and de Rham realisations of a 1-motive agree with the realisation of the attached geometric motive.
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CHAPTER 1

Notation

Let \( k \) be an algebraically closed field with a fixed embedding \( k \to \mathbb{C} \). If \( X \) is an algebraic variety defined over \( k \), we write \( X^{\text{an}} \) for the induced analytic space on \( X(\mathbb{C}) \).

We denote by \( \mathcal{G} \) the category of commutative connected algebraic groups over \( k \). They are automatically smooth.

We denote by \( \text{MHS}_k \) the category of mixed \( \mathbb{Q} \)-Hodge structures over \( k \). Objects are given by tuples \( V = (V_{\text{dR}}, V_{\text{sing}}, \phi) \) where \( V_{\text{sing}} \) is a filtered \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space, \( V_{\text{dR}} \) is a bifiltered \( k \)-vector space and \( \phi : V_{\text{sing}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \to V_{\text{dR}} \otimes_k \mathbb{C} \) is a filtered isomorphism. This datum is subject to the usual conditions, see [Del71]. The category \( \text{MHS}_k \) is abelian.

Following [HMS17, Definition 5.1.1] we denote by \( (k, \mathbb{Q})-\text{Vect} \) the category with objects given by tuples \( (V_{\text{dR}}, V_{\text{sing}}, \phi) \) where \( V_{\text{dR}} \) is a finite dimensional \( k \)-vector space, \( V_{\text{sing}} \) is a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector space and \( \phi : V_{\text{dR}} \otimes \mathbb{C} \to V_{\text{sing}} \otimes_k \mathbb{C} \) is an isomorphism. The category is abelian. The forgetful functor \( \text{MHS}_k \to (k, \mathbb{Q})-\text{Vect} \) is faithful and exact.

If \( W \) is a \( K \)-vector space for some field \( K \), we write \( W^\vee \) for its \( K \)-dual.

We denote by \( 1\text{-Mot}_k \) the category of iso-1-motives over \( k \), see Definition 2.1.

1.1. Semi-abelian varieties

If \( V \) is a \( k \)-vector-space, we denote \( \mathbb{G}_a(V) \) the affine algebraic group over \( k \) defined by \( V \). If \( T \) is a \( k \)-torus, we write \( X(T) = \text{Hom}_G(T, \mathbb{G}_m) \) for its character group. If \( X \) is a free abelian group of finite rank, we denote \( T(X) \) the \( k \)-torus with character group \( X \).

The datum of a semi-abelian variety \( G \) is equivalent to the datum of a homomorphism \( X(T) \to A^\vee(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_\mathbb{Q} \): the connecting morphism for the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to T \to G \to A \to 0
\]

gives a map \([G] : X(T) = \text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m) \to \text{Ext}^1(A, \mathbb{G}_m) = A^\vee(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})\). This construction is functorial. A morphism of semi-abelian varieties \( \alpha : G_1 \to G_2 \)
induces a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(T_1) & \xrightarrow{\alpha^\vee} & X(T_2) \\
\downarrow[G_1] & & \downarrow[G_2] \\
A_1^\vee(Q) & \xleftarrow{\alpha} & A_2^\vee(Q)
\end{array}
\]

This yields an equivalence between the category of semi-abelian varieties over $\mathbb{Q}$ and the category with objects given by group homomorphisms $X \to A^\vee(Q)$ where $X$ is a free abelian group and $A$ an abelian variety. Given a commutative diagram as above, we get back the morphism $\alpha$ as the composition $G_1 \to G_{\alpha^\vee \circ G_2} = G_2 \times_{A_2} A_1 \to G_2$.

We are often going to make use of this equivalence without mentioning it explicitly. To verify the equality $G_{\alpha^\vee \circ G_2} = G_2 \times_{A_2} A_1 = \alpha^*G_2$.

Remark 1.1. The map $X(T) \to A^\vee(Q)$ is zero if and only if $G \cong A \times T$. Given two maps $s_1 : X(T_1) \to A^\vee(Q)$ and $s_2 : X(T_2) \to A^\vee(Q)$ corresponding to $G_1$ and $G_2$, their sum defines $s : X(T_1) \oplus X(T_2) \to A^\vee(Q)$. It corresponds to the semiabelian variety $G$ obtained as the pull-back of $G_1 \times G_2 \to A \times A$ via the diagonal $A \to A \times A$. Its torus part is $T_1 \times T_2$. If $s_1 = 0$, then the composition $G \to G_1 \cong A \times T_1 \to T_1$ together with $G \to G_2$ induce an isomorphism $G \cong T_1 \times G_2$.

1.2. The exponential map

We review the construction and properties of the exponential map, fixing notations and normalisations for later. Let $G^\text{an}$ a connected commutative Lie group. We denote $g_C$ or $\text{Lie}(G^\text{an})$ the Lie algebra of invariant vector fields on $G^\text{an}$ and by $g_C^\vee$ or $\text{coLie}(G^\text{an})$ the dual space of invariant differential forms. If $V$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space, we can view it as a complex commutative Lie group $V^\text{an}$. In this case $\text{Lie}(V^\text{an}) = V$. 
Example 1.2. For $G_a = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t])$ we have $G_a^{an} = \mathbb{C}$. It has a canonical coordinate with the property $t(1) = 1$. Then its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_a^{an}$ is generated by $\frac{d}{dt}$ and its dual by $dt$. The canonical identification of $\mathfrak{g}_a^{an}$ with $G_a^{an}$ maps $\frac{d}{dt}$ to 1.

Let

$$\exp_G : \mathfrak{g}_C \to G^{an}_C$$

be the exponential map. It is uniquely characterised by functoriality with respect to analytic group homomorphisms and $d \exp_G = \text{id}$. Explicitly: Let $X \in \mathfrak{g}_C$ be a left invariant vector field and $\phi_X : G_a^{an} \to G_a^{an}$ the unique homomorphism with $d\phi_X(\frac{d}{dt}) = X$. Then $\exp_G(X) = \phi_X(1)$.

This leads to a short exact sequence

$$0 \to \Lambda \to \mathfrak{g}_C \to G^{an}_a \to 0.$$

For every path $\gamma : [0,1] \to G^{an}_a$, we define $I(\gamma) \in \mathfrak{g}_C$ by

$$I(\gamma)(\omega) := \int_{\gamma} \omega \quad \text{for all } \omega \in \mathfrak{g}_C^\vee.$$

By Stokes’ theorem we see that $I(\gamma)$ depends only on the homotopy class of $\gamma$. The pairing is non-degenerate so that $I(\gamma) = 0$ implies that $\gamma$ is closed and homotopy equivalent to zero.

For $X \in \mathfrak{g}_C$, let $\gamma_X : [0,1] \to G^{an}_a$ be the path obtained by applying $\exp_G$ to the straing path from 0 zu $X$ in $\mathfrak{g}_C$.

Lemma 1.3. We have $I(\gamma_X) = X$.

Proof. Let $\phi_X : G_a^{an} \to G^{an}_a$ be the homomorphism with $d\phi_X(\frac{d}{dt}) = X$. Let $\epsilon : [0,1] \to G_a^{an}$ be the straight path from 0 to 1, i.e., $\epsilon = \gamma_a^{\frac{d}{dt}}$. By construction $\gamma = \phi_X \circ \epsilon$. Let $\omega \in \mathfrak{g}_C^\vee$. Then

$$I(\gamma)(\omega) = \int_{\gamma_X} \omega = \int_{\epsilon} \phi_X^* \omega.$$

This reduces the lemma to $G^{an}_a = G^{an}_a$. In this case it suffices to evaluate in $\omega = dt$. The assertion follows because

$$\int_0^1 dt = 1.$$

Corollary 1.4. Let $P$ be a point in $G^{an}$ and $\gamma$ a path from 0 to $P$. Then we have

$$\exp_G(I(\gamma)) = P.$$

Proof. Put $X = I(\gamma)$ in Lemma 1.3. Then

$$I(\gamma) = I(\gamma I(\gamma))$$

and hence $\gamma$ and $\gamma I(\gamma)$ are homotopic. This gives

$$P = \gamma(1) = \gamma I(\gamma)(1) = \exp_G(I(\gamma)).$$
The lemma shows that integration is inverse to exponentiation as it should be. But this is precisely the definition of a logarithm and we may write
\[ \log_G(P) := I(\gamma). \]
Note that \( \log_G \) is multivalued. The map \( \gamma \mapsto I(\gamma) \) from the path space of \( G^{an} \) with the unit element of the group as base point taken modulo homotopy into the Lie algebra \( g \) identifies \( g_C \) with the universal covering space of \( G^{an} \).

We now restrict to closed paths. The maps
\[
\lambda \xrightarrow{\gamma} \pi_1(G^{an}, 0)
\]
are inverse to each other, in particular \( \Lambda \cong \pi_1(G, 0) \) and the fundamental group is abelian.

Let \( \sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \gamma_i \) with \( a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, \gamma_i : [0, 1] \to G^{an} \) a chain. We extend the definition of \( I \) and put
\[
I(\sigma) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i I(\gamma_i) \in g_C.
\]
If \( \gamma \) is closed, but \( \gamma(0) \neq 0 \), then \( \gamma I(\gamma) \) is still homologous to \( \gamma \). Hence
\[
\lambda \xrightarrow{\gamma} H_1^{sing}(G^{an}, \mathbb{Z})
\]
are inverse to each other. The two identifications are compatible with the Hurewitz map \( \pi_1(G^{an}, 0) \to H_1^{sing}(G^{an}, \mathbb{Z}) \), which is an isomorphism in this case.
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CHAPTER 2

Deligne’s 1-motives

We review Deligne’s category of 1-motives over an algebraically closed field $k$ embedded into $\mathbb{C}$. The cases of interest for us are $k = \mathbb{C}$ and $k = \mathbb{Q}$. In the latter case, we even have something new to say.

**Definition 2.1** (Deligne [Del74], Ch. 10). A 1-motive $M = [L \rightarrow G]$ over $k$ is the datum given by a semi-abelian group $G$ over $k$, a free abelian group of finite rank $L$ and a group homomorphism $L \rightarrow G(k)$. Morphisms of 1-motives are morphisms of complexes $L \rightarrow G$.

The category $1{-}\text{Mot}_k$ of iso-1-motives has the same objects, but morphism tensored by $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Remark 2.2.** The category of iso-1-motives is abelian. In this paper, we are always going to work in the category of iso-1-motives. The arguments often involve replacing $[L \rightarrow G]$ by an isogenuous $[L' \rightarrow G']$. This will sometimes happen tacitly.

We need to spell out the singular and de Rham realisation of [Del74], Ch. 10] in detail. Let $M = [L \rightarrow G]$ be a 1-motive. We write $G^{\text{an}}$ for the commutative Lie group over $\mathbb{C}$. Consider the exponential sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_1^{\text{sing}}(G^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \text{Lie}(G^{\text{an}}) \xrightarrow{\exp} G^{\text{an}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where we have used the identification of Section 1.2 Equation (2).

**Definition 2.3.** Let $T_{\text{sing}}(M)$ be the pull-back of $u : L \rightarrow G^{\text{an}}$ via $\exp$. The singular realisation of $M$ is the vector space $V_{\text{sing}}(M) = T_{\text{sing}}(M) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

By construction, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_1(G^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(M) \rightarrow L \otimes \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow 0.$$

In particular, $V_{\text{sing}}(M) \cong H_1(G^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$ if $L = 0$ and $V_{\text{sing}}(M) = L_{\mathbb{Q}}$ if $G = \{e\}$. The vector space $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ carries a weight filtration with

$$W_nV_{\text{sing}}(M) = \begin{cases} 0 & n \leq -3 \\ H_1(T, \mathbb{Q}) & n = -2 \\ H_1(G, \mathbb{Q}) & n = -1 \\ V_{\text{sing}}(M) & n \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

(here $0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow G \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$ is the decomposition of $G$ into a torus and an abelian variety).

We now enlarge the category $1{-}\text{Mot}$ to the abelian category $1{-}\text{MOT}$ with objects of the form $[L \rightarrow G]$ with $G$ in the category $\mathcal{C}G$ of commutative
algebraic groups over \( k \) and morphisms given by morphisms of complexes tensored by \( \mathbb{Q} \). We may view an object \( G \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) as the complex \( 0 \to G \).

We briefly recall \cite{Del74} Constr. 10.1.7. Let \( \mathbb{G}_a \) be the additive group. For \( M = [L \to G] \) in \( 1\text{-Mot}_k \) we obtain a short exact sequence of \( k \)-vector spaces

\[
0 \to \text{Hom}_{ab}(L, \mathbb{G}_a) \to \text{Ext}^1_{1\text{-MOT}}(M, \mathbb{G}_a) \to \text{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{C}}(G, \mathbb{G}_a) \to 0.
\]

In particular, these are finite dimensional vector spaces.

**Definition 2.4.** Let \( M = [L \to G] \) be in \( 1\text{-Mot}_k \). We let \( G^\natural \) be the universal vector extension

\[
0 \to \mathbb{G}_a(\text{Ext}^1_{\mathcal{C}}(G, \mathbb{G}_a)^\vee) \to G^\natural \to G \to 0
\]

of \( G \) and \( [L \to M^\natural] \in 1\text{-MOT}_k \) the induced universal vector extension

\[
0 \to \mathbb{G}_a(\text{Ext}^1_{1\text{-MOT}}(M, \mathbb{G}_a)^\vee) \to [L \to M^\natural] \to [L \to G] \to 0
\]

of \( M \). We define the de Rham realisation of \( M \) as

\[
V_{\text{dR}}(M) := \text{Lie}(M^\natural).
\]

**Remark 2.5.** Note that our notation deviates from Deligne’s: he writes \( G^\natural \) for the algebraic group that we denote \( M^\natural \). We want to be able to distinguish between \( G^\natural \) and \( M^\natural \) when discussing \( M = [L \to G] \).

It carries a weight and a Hodge filtration

\[
F^pV_{\text{dR}}(M) = \begin{cases} 
0 & p > 0 \\
\ker(\text{Lie}(M^\natural) \to \text{Lie}(G)) & p = 0 \\
V_{\text{dR}}(M) & p \leq -1
\end{cases}
\]

see \cite{Del74} Constr. 10.1.8. Note that \( F^0V_{\text{dR}}(M) = \text{Ext}^1_{1\text{-MOT}}(M, \mathbb{G}_a)^\vee \).

Moreover, there is a filtered comparison isomorphism \( V_{\text{sing}}(M)_{\mathbb{C}} \cong V_{\text{dR}}(M)_{\mathbb{C}} \).

It is constructed as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
L & \longrightarrow & M^\natural,\text{an} \\
\exp & & \exp \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\text{Lie}(M^\natural)_{\mathbb{C}} & \longrightarrow & \text{Lie}(G)_{\mathbb{C}} \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
H^1_{\text{sing}}(M^\natural, \mathbb{Z}) & \cong & H^1_{\text{sing}}(G^\natural, \mathbb{Z})
\end{array}
\]

The map at the bottom is an isomorphism by homotopy invariance: \( M^\natural \) is a vector bundle over \( G \). Hence the pull-back of \( L \to G^\natural \) to \( \text{Lie}(G)_{\mathbb{C}} \) (this is \( T_{\text{sing}}(M) \)) agrees with the pull-back of \( L \to M^\natural,\text{an} \) to \( \text{Lie}(M^\natural)_{\mathbb{C}} \). Let

\[
\phi_M : V_{\text{sing}}(M)_{\mathbb{C}} \to \text{Lie}(M^\natural)_{\mathbb{C}}
\]

be this map.

**Lemma 2.6** \cite{Del74} Constr. 10.1.8. This is a filtered isomorphism.
In all, the assignment \( M \mapsto (V_{\text{dR}}(M), V_{\text{sing}}(M), \phi_M) \) defines a functor from the category of iso-1-motives to the category of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-mixed Hodge structures over \( k \)
\[
V : 1-\text{Mot} \to \text{MHS}_k.
\]

**Theorem 2.7** (Deligne \[Del74\], Construction 10.1.3, pp. 53–56]). In the case \( k = \mathbb{C} \), the functor \( V : 1-\text{Mot}_\mathbb{C} \to \text{MHS}_\mathbb{C} \) is fully faithful with image the polarisable Hodge structures whose only non-zero Hodge numbers are \((-1, -1), (-1, 0), (0, -1), (0, 0)\).

Note that a mixed Hodge structure with Hodge numbers as above is polarisable if and only if the graded piece in weight \(-1\) is polarisable.

**Proposition 2.8.** In the case \( k = \mathbb{Q} \), the functor \( F : 1-\text{Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \to \text{MHS}_\mathbb{Q} \) is fully faithful.

**Proof.** Let \( M = [L \to G], M' = [L' \to G'] \in 1-\text{Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \) and \( \gamma : V(M) \to V(M') \) a morphism of Hodge structures over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). By extension of scalars, we have a morphism of Hodge structures
\[
(V_{\text{dR}}(M), V_{\text{sing}}(M), \phi) \xrightarrow{\gamma_{\mathbb{C}}} (V_{\text{dR}}(M'), V_{\text{sing}}(M'), \phi)
\]
over \( \mathbb{C} \). By Deligne’s theorem \( \gamma_{\mathbb{C}} \) is induced by a morphism \( \tilde{\gamma} \) in \( 1-\text{Mot}_\mathbb{C} \). After replacing \( L \) by a rational multiple it is represented by
\[
\tilde{\gamma} : [L \to G_\mathbb{C}] \to [L' \to G'_\mathbb{C}].
\]
It remains to show that the induced morphism of algebraic groups \( G_\mathbb{C} \to G'_{\mathbb{C}} \) is even defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). We have
\[
\text{Lie}(G) = V_{\text{dR}}(M)/F^0V_{\text{dR}}(M).
\]
Hence the morphism of Hodge structures over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) also induces a compatible homomorphism
\[
\text{Lie}(G) \to \text{Lie}(G')
\]
defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). By the analytic subgroup theorem (see Corollary \[A.9\]) this is enough to imply that the group homomorphism is defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). \( \square \)

**Remark 2.9.** Meanwhile André has shown in \[And18\] that even \( 1-\text{Mot}_k \to \text{MHS}_\mathbb{C} \) is fully faithful for all algebraically closed \( k \subset \mathbb{C} \).

Recall again the functor \( M \mapsto M^h \) from 1-motives to commutative algebraic groups.

**Proposition 2.10.**
\( (1) \) This functor is faithful and exact.
\( (2) \) Let \( H = M^h \) for a 1-motive \( M \). Let
\[
0 \to H_1 \to H \to H_2 \to 0
\]
be a short exact sequence in \( \mathcal{G} \). Then there is a short exact sequence
\[
0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0
\]
in $1$–Mot$_k$ and a factorisation $M_1^\dagger \to H_1 \subset M^\dagger$, $M^\dagger \to M_2^\dagger \to H_2$

and, moreover,

$$T_{\text{sing}}(M) \cap \text{Lie}(H_1)_C = T_{\text{sing}}(M_1).$$

**Proof.** Instead of proving the first claim from scratch (as might be the honest approach), we deduce it from Theorem 2.7. The assignment $H \mapsto \text{Lie}(H)$ is faithful and exact on connected commutative algebraic groups. Moreover, $M \mapsto V_{\text{dR}}(M) = \text{Lie}(M^\dagger)$ is faithful and exact because the functor from iso-$1$-motives to mixed Hodge structures is faithful and exact. Hence the functor $1$–Mot$_k \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_k$ is faithful and exact.

Now let $M = [L \to G]$ be a $1$-motive and

$$0 \to H_1 \to M^\dagger \to H_2 \to 0$$

a short exact sequence of connected commutative algebraic groups. By the structure theory of commutative algebraic groups, there are canonical decompositions

$$0 \to V_i \to H_i \to G_i \to 0$$

with $G_i$ semi-abelian and $V_i$ a vector group. Moreover, the sequence

$$0 \to G_1 \to G \to G_2 \to 0$$

is exact.

Let $L \to M^\dagger$ be the canonical lift. Note that it is injective. We define $L_1$ as the intersection of $L$ with $H_1$ and $L_2 = L/L_1$ (modulo torsion). By construction, $L_1 \to L \to G$ factors via $G_1$ and $L \to G \to G_2$ via $L_2 \to G_2$. We put $M_i = [L_i \to G_i]$. By construction the sequence

$$0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0$$

is exact.

By construction there are maps $L_i \to H_i$. By the universal property of $M^\dagger$ this induces morphisms $M_i^\dagger \to H_i$, compatible with the morphisms to/from $M^\dagger$. For $i = 1$, the composition $M_1^\dagger \to H_1 \to M^\dagger$ is injective, hence so is $M_1^\dagger \to H_1$. The converse argument gives surjectivity of $M_2^\dagger \to H_2$.

We abbreviate $T_{\text{sing}}(H_1) = T_{\text{sing}}(M) \cap \text{Lie}(H_1)_C$. By definition, $L_1 \to H_1^\dagger$ is the pull-back of $L \to M^\dagger$. Moreover, $\text{Lie}(H_1)_C \to \text{Lie}(M^\dagger)_C$ is the pullback of $H_1 \to M^\dagger$ via the exponential map. Hence

$$T_{\text{sing}}(H_1) = T_{\text{sing}}(M^\dagger) \cap \text{Lie}(H_1)_C = \exp_{H_1}^{-1} L_1.$$

Hence the sequence

$$0 \to \ker(\exp_{H_1}) \to T_{\text{sing}}(H_1) \to L_1 \to 0$$

is exact. We compare it with the same sequence for $M_1^\dagger$:

$$0 \to \ker(\exp_{M_1^\dagger}) \to T_{\text{sing}}(M_1) \to L_1 \to 0.$$

In both cases, the kernel computes $H_1^\text{sing}(G_1, \mathbb{Z})$ because they are vector groups over $G_1$. Hence they are the same. This implies the claim $T_{\text{sing}}(H_1) \cong T_{\text{sing}}(M_1)$. □
We are going to show later (see Theorem 7.4) that the image of the functor $1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \to \text{MHS}_\mathbb{Q}$ is closed under subquotients.
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Let $M = [L \to G]$ be a 1-motive over $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Definition 3.1.** The set of periods of $M$ is the union of the sets of entries of the period matrices of the comparison isomorphism $V_{\text{sing}}(M)_C \to V_{\text{dR}}(M)_C$ with respect to all $\mathbb{Q}$-bases of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and $\mathbb{Q}$-bases of $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$. We denote it $\mathcal{P}(M)$ and by $\mathcal{P}(\langle M \rangle)$ the $\mathbb{Q}$-subvector space of $\mathbb{C}$ generated by $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

For any subcategory $C \subseteq 1\text{-Mot}_G$ we write $\mathcal{P}(C)$ for the union of the $\mathcal{P}(M)$ for all objects $M \in C$ and $\mathcal{P}(\langle C \rangle)$ for the vector space over $\mathbb{Q}$ generated by $\mathcal{P}(C)$. In particular we write $\mathcal{P}(1\text{-Mot}_G)$ for the union of all $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

Equivalently, we can define $\mathcal{P}(M)$ as the image of the period pairing $V_{\text{dR}}(M) \times V_{\text{sing}}(M) \to \mathbb{C}$.

This description makes clear that it is not a vector space. We write $\omega(\sigma)$ or more suggestively $\int_\sigma \omega$ for the value of the period pairing for $\sigma \in V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and $\omega \in V_{\text{dR}}(M)$. The notation will be justified later.

**Lemma 3.2.** The vector space $\mathcal{P}(M)$ agrees with the set of periods of the additive subcategory generated by $M$ and with the set of periods of the full abelian subcategory closed under subquotients generated by $M$. The set $\mathcal{P}(1\text{-Mot}_G)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-subvector space of $\mathbb{C}$.

**Proof.** We repeat the easy argument of [HMS17, Proposition 11.2.4]. Every single $\mathcal{P}(M)$ is stable under scaling by elements of $\mathbb{Q}$ because $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space. The sum of two periods on motives $M$ and $M'$ is realised as a period of the direct sum $M \times M'$ of the motives. The set of periods remains unchanged when adding subquotients of objects. \hfill \Box

We want to make the definition of $\int_\sigma \omega$ explicit. Let $M = [L \to G]$ be a 1-motive over $\mathbb{Q}$. Recall that $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$ was defined as $\text{Lie}(M^h)$ for a certain vector extension of $G$. Hence $V_{\text{dR}}(M) = \text{coLie}(M^h)$. Every cotangent vector of $M^h$ defines a unique $M^h$-equivariant differential form on $M^h$ and any equivariant global differential arises in this way. Therefore we may make the identification $V_{\text{dR}}(M) \cong \Omega^1(M^h)^{M^1}$.

with the space of invariant differentials and we may from now on view $\omega$ as a differential form on $M^h$. Recall also that $T_{\text{sing}}(M)$ is a lattice in $\text{Lie}(M^h,\text{an})$. 


The latter maps to $M^\text{h,an}$ via the exponential map for the Lie group $M^\text{k,an}$, see Section 1.2. Hence an element $u \in T_{\text{sing}}(M)$ defines a point
\[ \exp(u) \in M^\text{k,an} \]
and by composition of a straight path from 0 to $u$ with the exponential map a path
\[ \gamma_u : [0, 1] \to M^\text{h,an} \]
from 0 to $\exp(u)$. The period pairing is then computed as
\[ \int_u \omega = \int_{\gamma_u} \omega \]
where the right hand side is an honest integral on a manifold. In particular, for $u \in \ker(\exp : \text{Lie}(M^\text{h,an}) \to M^\text{k,an})$, the path $\gamma_u$ is closed and hence it defines an element of $H_1(M^\text{h,an}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(G^\text{an}, \mathbb{Z})$. Conversely, every element $\sigma \in H_1(M^\text{h,an}, \mathbb{Z})$ is represented by a formal linear combination $\sigma = \sum a_i \gamma_i$ of closed loops $\gamma_i$. The cycle defines a linear map
\[ I(\sigma) : \text{coLie}(M^\text{h,an}) \to \mathbb{C} \]
\[ \omega \mapsto \sum a_i \int_{\gamma_i} \omega. \]
In other words, $I(\sigma) \in \text{Lie}(M^\text{h,an})^\vee \cong \text{Lie}(M^\text{k,an})$. As spelled out in Section 1.2, the two operations are inverse to each other: $I(\gamma_u) = u$ for $u \in \ker(\exp)$ and $\gamma(I(\sigma))$ is homologous to $\sigma \in H_1(M^\text{h,an}, \mathbb{Z})$.

**Lemma 3.3.** We have $\exp(u) \in M^k(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$.

**Proof.** By definition, we have the commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Lie}(M^k) & \xrightarrow{\exp} & M^k \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
T_{\text{sing}}(M) & \longrightarrow & L
\end{array}
\]
which we evaluated at $u \in T_{\text{sing}}(M)$. The value is in $M^k(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ because $L$ takes values there. \qed

For the record, the above argument proves:

**Proposition 3.4.** Every period of a 1-motive is of the form
\[ \int_\gamma \omega \]
where $\omega$ is an algebraic 1-form on a commutative algebraic group $G$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\gamma$ is a path from 0 to a point $P \in G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$.

There are two types of obvious sources of relations between periods of 1-motives:
(1) (Bilinearity) Let $M$ be a 1-motive over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M)$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then
\[
\int_{\mu_1 \sigma_1 + \mu_2 \sigma_2} (\lambda_1 \omega_1 + \lambda_2 \omega_2) = \sum_{i,j=1,2} \mu_i \lambda_j \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j.
\]

(2) (Functoriality) Let $f : M \to M'$ be a morphism in $1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$. Let $\sigma \in V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and $\omega' \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M)$. Then
\[
\int_{\sigma} f^* \omega' = \int_{f_* \sigma} \omega'.
\]

As a special case we get the relations coming from short exact sequences: consider
\[0 \to M' \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} M'' \to 0\]
in $1-\text{Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Then the period matrix for $M$ will be block triangular, hence will contain plenty of zeroes. Explicitly: for $\sigma' \in V_{\text{sing}}(M')$ and $\omega'' \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M'')$, we have
\[
\int_{i_* \sigma'} p^* \omega'' = \int_{\sigma'} p^* \omega'' = \int_{p_* i_* \sigma'} \omega'' = 0
\]
because $i^* p^* \omega'' = 0$ and $p_* i_* \sigma' = 0$.
Indeed, this is the only source of relations between periods of 1-motives as we show.

**Definition 3.5.** For $u \in V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ we define $\text{Ann}(u) \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M)$ as the left kernel of the period pairing.

**Theorem 3.6 (Subgroup theorem for 1-motives).** There exists an exact sequence in $1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$
\[0 \to M_1 \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} M_2 \to 0\]
such that $\text{Ann}(u) = p^* V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_2)$ and $u \in i_* V_{\text{sing}}(M_1)$.

**Proof.** We consider the connected commutative algebraic group $M^h$. Without loss of generality, $u \in T_{\text{sing}}(M)$. By Lemma 3.3, $u \in \text{Lie}(M^h)_{\mathbb{C}}$ with $\exp(u) \in M^h(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. We apply the analytic subgroup theorem in the version Theorem A.2. Hence there is a short exact sequence in $\text{C}^G$
\[0 \to H_1 \to M^h \xrightarrow{\pi} H_2 \to 0\]
such that $u \in \text{Lie}(H_1)_{\mathbb{C}}$ and $\text{Ann}(u) = \pi^* \text{coLie}(H_2)$. By Proposition 2.10, we find an associated short sequence in $1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$
\[0 \to M_1 \to M^h \xrightarrow{\pi} M_2 \to 0\]
such that $T_{\text{sing}}(M_1) = T_{\text{sing}}(M)\cap \text{Lie}(H_1)_{\mathbb{C}}$. In particular, $u \in T_{\text{sing}}(M_1)$. Because of the short exact sequence of motives, we have $\text{coLie}(M^h_2) = V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_2) \subset \text{Ann}(u)$. On the other hand, Proposition 2.10 also gives a surjection $M^h_2 \to H_2$, hence
\[
\text{Ann}(u) = \text{coLie}(H_2) \subset \text{coLie}(M^h_2) \subset \text{Ann}(u).
\]
This implies equality of co-Lie algebras and hence even $M^h_2 \cong H_2$. □
Remark 3.7. The proof shows that the decompositions in terms of algebraic groups (Theorem [A.2] and in terms of 1-motives agree.

Our main aim is to prove the following, which was formulated as a conjecture in [Wü12]:

**Theorem 3.8 (Kontsevich’s period conjecture for 1-motives).** All $\mathbb{Q}$-linear relations between elements of $\mathcal{P}(1\text{-Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}})$ are induced by bilinearity and functoriality.

More precisely, for every 1-motive $M$ the relations between elements of $\mathcal{P}(M)$ are generated by bilinearity and functoriality for morphisms in the full abelian subcategory of $1\text{-Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ closed under subquotients generated by $M$, or equivalently, morphisms of the induced mixed Hodge structures over $\mathbb{Q}$.

**Proof.** We consider a linear relation between periods. For $i = 1, \ldots, n$ let $\alpha_i = \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_i$ be periods for 1-motives $M_i$ and let $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ be such that

$$\lambda_1 \alpha_1 + \lambda_2 \alpha_2 + \cdots + \lambda_n \alpha_n = 0. \quad (3)$$

We have already argued in Lemma 3.2 that a linear combination of periods can be represented as single period. We now have to go through the construction carefully in order to check that no relations other than bilinearity and functoriality are used.

We put $M = M_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus M_n$. By pull-back via the projection, we can view each $\omega_i$ as an element of $V_{\text{sing}}^\vee (M)$. By push-forward via the inclusion we may view each $\sigma_i$ in $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$. We then put $\sigma = \sum \sigma_i$ and $\omega = \sum \lambda_j \omega_j$. By the additivity relation

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega = \sum_{i,j} \lambda_j \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j.$$  

By the functoriality relation $\int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j$ vanishes for $i \neq j$ and gives $\alpha_i$ for $i = j$. Hence the left hand side of (3) equals $\int_{\sigma} \omega$.

We are now in the situation

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega = 0$$

on the 1-motive $M$. In other words, $\omega \in \text{Ann}(\sigma)$. By Theorem 3.6 there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M' \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} M'' \to 0$$

in $1\text{-Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\sigma = i_* \sigma'$ for $\sigma' \in V_{\text{sing}}(M')$ and $\omega = p^* \omega''$ for $\omega'' \in V_{\text{dr}}^\vee (M'') = \text{Ann}(\sigma)$.

Hence the vanishing of

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega = \int_{i_* \sigma'} p^* \omega'' = \int_{\sigma'} 0$$

is now implied by functoriality of 1-motives. □

In particular, this implies a result on transcendence of periods.
Theorem 3.9 (Transcendence). Let $M = [L \to G]$ be a 1-motive. Let
\[ \sigma \in V_{\text{sing}}(M), \quad \omega \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M) \]
be such that
\[ \alpha := \int \omega \neq 0. \]
Then $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ if and only if there are $\phi, \psi \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M)$ with $\omega = \phi + \psi$ such that
\[ \int \sigma \psi = 0 \]
and the image of $\phi$ in $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(G)$ vanishes.

Proof. We begin with the easy direction. The short exact sequence
\[ 0 \to [0 \to G] \to M \to [L \to 0] \to 0 \]
induces a short exact sequence
\[ 0 \to V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([L \to 0]) \to V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M) \to V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([0 \to G]) \to 0. \]
Suppose that the image of $\phi$ in $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([0 \to G])$ vanishes, or equivalently, that $\phi \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([L \to 0])$.

Let $\bar{\sigma}$ be the image of $\sigma$ in $V_{\text{sing}}([L \to 0])$. Then
\[ \alpha = \int \sigma \phi = \int \sigma \phi \]
is a period for $[L \to 0]$. It is a general fact that $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([\mathbb{Z}^r \to 0]) = \text{coLie} (\mathbb{A}^r)$ and all its periods are algebraic.

Conversely, assume that $\alpha$ is algebraic and non-zero. This means that we can write $\alpha$ as $\int \sigma' \omega'$ with $\omega' = \partial dt$ and $\sigma' \in V_{\text{sing}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0])$ the standard basis vector. Let $\Sigma = (\sigma, -\sigma') \in V_{\text{sing}}(M \oplus [\mathbb{Z} \to 0])$ and $\Omega = (\omega, \omega') \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M \oplus [\mathbb{Z} \to 0])$. By assumption
\[ \int \Sigma \Omega = \int \sigma \omega - \int \sigma' \omega' = 0. \]
By the Subgroup Theorem for 1-motives, Theorem 3.6, there is a short exact sequence of iso-1-motives
\[ \begin{align*}
0 & \to M_1 \xrightarrow{\iota, \iota_{[0]}} M \oplus [\mathbb{Z} \to 0] \xrightarrow{p+q} M_2 \to 0
\end{align*} \tag{4} \]
and $\sigma_1 \in V_{\text{sing}}(M_1)$, $\omega_2 \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M_2)$ such that
\[ (\iota, \iota_{[0]}), \sigma_1 = (\sigma, -\sigma'), \quad p^* \omega_2 = \omega, \quad q^* \omega_2 = \omega'. \]
The map $q : [\mathbb{Z} \to 0] \to M_2$ does not vanish because the pullback of $\omega_2$ is $\omega'$. The latter is non-zero because $\alpha$ is assumed to be non-zero. The non-vanishing of the map already implies that $[\mathbb{Z} \to 0]$ is a direct summand of $M_2$. We explain the argument: Let $M_2 = [L_2 \to G_2]$. Then the composition
\[ [\mathbb{Z} \to 0] \to [L_2 \to G_2] \to [L_2 \to 0] \]
is non-trivial. The composition $\mathbb{Z} \to L_2$ does not vanish, hence we can decompose $L_2$ up to isogeny into the image of $\mathbb{Z}$ and a direct complement. This defines a section of our map.
We decompose \( M_2 = [Z \to 0] \oplus M'_2 \). Hence \( \omega_2 = \phi_2 + \psi_2 \) with \( \phi_2 \) coming from \([Z \to 0]\) and \( \psi_2 \) from the complement \( M'_2 \). Let \( \phi = p^* \phi_2 \) and \( \psi = p^* \psi_2 \) be their images in \( V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M) \). Then \( \omega = p^* \omega_2 = \phi + \psi \) and hence

\[
\alpha = \int_\sigma \omega = \int_\sigma \phi + \int_\sigma \psi.
\]

By splitting off the direct summand \([Z \to 0]\) from the sequence \(4\), we obtain the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to M_1 \to M \to M'_2 \to 0.
\]

The element \( \sigma = \iota_* \sigma_1 \in V_{\text{sing}}(M) \) is induced from \( M_1 \) and \( \psi = p^* \psi_2 \) from \( M'_2 \). Hence \( \int_\sigma \psi = 0 \).

The element \( \phi = p^* \phi_2 \) is induced from \([Z \to 0]\), hence it is in the image of

\[
V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([Z \to 0]) \to V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([L \to 0]) \to V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M).
\]

Hence its image in \( V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(G) \) vanishes. \(\square\)

The general period formalism explained in the appendix, see Section C.5, also implies a dimension formula. This is a consequence of \cite{HMS17}, Section 8.4 and Chapter 13 or in more detail \cite{Hub18}. We fix \( M \in 1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \).

Let \( \langle M \rangle \subset 1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \) be the full abelian subcategory closed under subquotients generated by \( M \). We put (see Definition C.11)

\[
E(M) = \left\{ (\phi_N) \in \prod_{N \in \langle M \rangle} \text{End}_\mathbb{Q}(V_{\text{sing}}(N)) \mid \phi_{N'} \circ f = f \circ \phi_N \forall f : N \to N' \right\}.
\]

This is a subalgebra of \( \text{End}_\mathbb{Q}(V_{\text{sing}}(M)) \) (see Section C.4), hence finite dimensional over \( \mathbb{Q} \).

By \cite{HMS17} Theorem 7.3.19 (see also Proposition C.12), the category \( \langle M \rangle \) is equivalent to finitely generated \( E(M) \)-modules.

**Corollary 3.10.** We have

\[
\dim_\mathbb{Q} P(M) = \dim_\mathbb{Q} E(M).
\]

**Proof.** The period conjecture for \( 1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q} \) implies the period conjecture for \( \langle M \rangle \) (see \cite{Hub18} Proposition 5.2) because the category is closed under subquotients. By Corollary C.17 this implies the dimension formula. \(\square\)

**Remark 3.11.** This is a clear qualitative characterisation. However, it is by no means obvious to compute the explicit value for a given \( M \). We will carry this out in Chapter 9.
CHAPTER 4

First examples

Before turning to the case of period numbers of curves more generally, we give some examples, all of them very classical. They do not rely on the full strength of Theorem 3.6 but could be deduced directly from the analytic subgroup theorem as in Theorem A.2. We still prefer to go via Theorem 3.6 in order to demonstrate the method.

4.1. Squaring the circle

We want to prove transcendence of \( \pi \) or rather more naturally in our setting, of \( 2\pi i \).

Let \( M_1 = [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \). Then \( \hat{M}_1 = \mathbb{G}_m \) because \( \text{Ext}^1_G(\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{G}_a) = 0 \). Hence by definition
\[
V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_1) = \text{coLie}(\mathbb{G}_m) = \Omega^1(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\mathbb{G}_m}.
\]
Let \( \omega_1 = \frac{dz}{z} \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_1) \).

Also by definition
\[
V_{\text{sing}}(M_1) = \ker(\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\text{an}} \to \mathbb{G}_m^{\text{an}}) = \ker(\exp : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^*)\n\]
Let \( \gamma_1 : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{C}^* \) given by \( \gamma_1(s) = e^{2\pi is} \) be the positively oriented loop around 0. Let \( \sigma_1 = I(\gamma_1) \in \text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\text{an}} \) in the notation of Section 1.2. Then
\[
\int_{\sigma_1} \omega_1 = \int_{\gamma_1} \frac{dz}{z} = 2\pi i.
\]

Corollary 4.1 (Lindemann 1882). The period \( 2\pi i \) is transcendental.

First proof. We apply Theorem 3.9 to this period. Assume that \( 2\pi i \) is algebraic. Then by the theorem, we have
\[
\omega_1 = \phi + \psi
\]
such that the image of \( \phi \) vanishes in \( V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(\mathbb{G}_m) \) (because \( G = \mathbb{G}_m \) in our case) and \( \int_{\sigma_1} \psi = 0 \). As \( G = M_1^\flat \), the map \( V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_1) \to V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(G) \) is an isomorphism. Hence \( \phi = 0 \). This means \( \omega_1 = \psi \) and hence \( 2\pi i = 0 \). This is a contraction, hence \( 2\pi i \) is indeed transcendental.

We are also going to give a second proof directly from the analytic subgroup theorem for 1-motives.

Let \( M_2 = [\mathbb{Z} \to 0] \). Then \( M_2^\flat = \mathbb{G}_a \) because \( \text{Ext}_1^{1-\text{MOT}}(M_2, \mathbb{G}_a) = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{G}_a) = \mathbb{G}_a \). Hence
\[
V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_2) = \text{coLie}(\mathbb{A}^1) = \Omega^1(\mathbb{A}^1)^{\mathbb{A}^1}.
\]
Let $\omega_2 = dt \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M_2)$.

In this case $\exp : \text{Lie}(M^\text{an}_2) \to M^\text{an}_2$ is the identity on $\mathbb{C}$. The lattice $\mathbb{Z}$ embeds naturally into $M^\text{an}_2 = \mathbb{C}$. Hence

$$V^\text{sing}(M_2) = \exp^{-1}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z}.$$ 

Let $\gamma_2$ be the straight path from 0 to 1 in $\mathbb{C}_a$. Let $\sigma_2 = I(\gamma_2) \in \mathfrak{g}^\text{an}$. We have

$$\int_{\sigma_2} \omega_2 = \int_{\gamma_2} dt = 1.$$ 

**Second proof of Corollary 4.1.** Assume that $2\pi i$ is algebraic. This means that

$$2\pi i + \alpha = 0$$

for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. In the notion from above

$$M = M_1 \times M_2 = [\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{G}_m].$$

Hence

$$V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M) = V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M_1) \times V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M_2), \quad V^\text{sing}(M) = V^\text{sing}(M_1) \times V^\text{sing}(M_2).$$

We choose

$$\omega = (\omega_1, \alpha \omega_2) \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M).$$

Note that this only well-defined because $\alpha$ is algebraic. We choose

$$\sigma = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2) \in V^\text{sing}(M).$$

Hence

$$\int_{\sigma} \omega = \int_{\sigma_1} \omega_1 + \int_{\sigma_2} \alpha \omega_2 = 2\pi i + \alpha \cdot 1 = 0.$$ 

We apply Theorem 3.6 to the motive $M$ and the classes $\omega$ and $\sigma$. Their period vanishes, hence there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M' \xrightarrow{i} M \xrightarrow{p} M'' \to 0$$

such that $\sigma$ is in the image of $i_*$ and $\omega$ is in the image of $p^*$. 

Note that $M$ is the product of two simple non-isomorphic 1-motives, hence there are only four possible choices for $M'$:

$$0, M_1 \times 0, 0 \times M_2, M.$$ 

We go through the cases. If $M' = 0$, then the image of $i_*$ is zero and hence $\sigma = 0$. This is false.

If $M' = M_1 \times 0$, then the second component $\sigma_2$ of $\sigma$ is zero. This is false. The same argument also eliminates $M' = 0 \times M_2$.

Hence we have $M' = M$ and $M'' = 0$. Then the image of $p^*$ is zero and hence $\omega = 0$. This is false.

We have a contradiction and $2\pi i$ cannot be algebraic. \qed
4.2. Transcendence of logarithms

We now turn to logarithms of algebraic numbers. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we have

$$\int_1^\alpha \frac{dz}{z} = \log(\alpha)$$

(with the branch depending of choice of path from 1 to $\alpha$). Hence this obviously a period. In order to apply our theorems directly, we identify it the period of a 1-motive.

For $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, we put

$$M(\alpha) = [Z \stackrel{1\to\alpha}{\to} \mathbb{G}_m].$$

If $\alpha$ is a root of unity, this is the motive $M = M_1 \times M_2$ considered in the last section. The extension

$$0 \to [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \to M(\alpha) \to [Z \to 0] \to 0$$

is non-split otherwise. The exact sequence induces an exact sequence

$$0 \to \mathbb{G}_m \to M(\alpha) \to A^1 \to 0$$

of the universal vector extensions. By definition, $M(\alpha)^h$ is an extension of $\mathbb{G}_m$ by $A^1 = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{G}_a)$. The sequence gives a canonical splitting, so we identify

$$M(\alpha)^h = A^1 \times \mathbb{G}_m.$$

Alternatively, we may use the fact that $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{G}_a) = \text{Hom}(\mathbb{G}_a, \mathbb{G}_m) = \text{Ext}^1(\mathbb{G}_m, \mathbb{G}_a) = 0$, hence $M(\alpha)^h$ splits uniquely. We put

$$\omega = (0, dz/z) \in V_{\text{dR}}(M(\alpha)) = \text{coLie}(A^1 \times \mathbb{G}_m).$$

By definition, the singular realisation of $M(\alpha)$ is

$$\exp^{-1}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(Z) \subset \text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\text{an}}$$

hence we have

$$V_{\text{sing}}(M(\alpha)) = (I(\gamma_1), I(\gamma(\alpha)))_{\mathbb{Q}} \subset \text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\text{an}}$$

with $\gamma_1$ as before the positively oriented loop around 0 and $\gamma(\alpha)$ a path from 1 to $\alpha$ in $\mathbb{G}_m^{\text{an}} = \mathbb{C}^*$. Note that the basis depends on the choice of path $\gamma(\alpha)$, but the lattice does not. We put $\sigma(\alpha) = I(\gamma(\alpha)) \in V_{\text{sing}}(M(\alpha))$. Hence

$$\int_{\sigma(\alpha)} \frac{dz}{z} = \int_{\gamma(\alpha)} \frac{dz}{z} = \log(\alpha)$$

with again the choice of logarithm determined by the choice of path.

By definition, the period for $M(\alpha)$ uses the canonical embedding

$$V_{\text{sing}}(M(\alpha)) \subset \text{coLie}(M(\alpha)^h) = \text{Lie}(A^1)^{\text{an}} \times \text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m)^{\text{an}} = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$$

given by

$$\sigma_1 \to (0, \sigma_1), \sigma(\alpha) \mapsto \sigma(\alpha)^h = (1, \sigma(\alpha)) = I(\gamma(\alpha)^h)$$
with \( \gamma(\alpha)^k(s) = (s, \gamma(\alpha)(s)) \in M(\alpha)^k \text{an} = \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^* \). The period \( \omega(\sigma(\alpha)) \) is defined by applying the cotangent vector \( \omega \) to the tangent vector \( \sigma(\alpha)^k \). Hence the period pairing gives
\[
\omega(\sigma(\alpha)) = \int_{\gamma(\alpha)^k} \frac{dz}{z} = \int_{\gamma(\alpha)} \frac{dz}{z} = \log(\alpha).
\]

**Corollary 4.2 (Transcendence of logarithms, Gelfond, Schneider 1934).** Let \( \alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) with \( \alpha \neq 1 \). Then \( \log(\alpha) \) is transcendental.

**Proof.** If \( \alpha \) is a root of unity, then \( \log(\alpha) \) is a rational multiple of \( 2\pi i \), whose transcendence we have already established. From now on assume that \( \alpha \) is not a root of unity and hence \( M(\alpha) \) non-split. Let \( \omega \) and \( \sigma(\alpha)^k \) be as above. Assume that \( \int_{\sigma(\alpha)} \omega \) is algebraic. By Theorem 3.9 there is a decomposition
\[
\omega = \psi + \phi
\]
such that \( \int_{\sigma(\alpha)} \psi = 0 \) and the image of \( \phi \) vanishes in \( V^\vee_{dR}(\mathbb{G}_m) \). We first concentrate on \( \psi \). We apply Theorem 3.6 to \( \psi \). Hence there is a short exact sequence
\[
0 \to M' \xrightarrow{i} M(\alpha) \xrightarrow{p} M'' \to 0
\]
such that \( \sigma(\alpha) \) is in the image of \( i_* \) and \( \psi \) is in the image of \( p^* \). There are only three possibilities for \( M' \):
\[
0, [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m], M(\alpha).
\]
We exclude \( M' = 0 \) (because \( \sigma(\alpha) \neq 0 \)) and \( M' = [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \) (because \( \sigma(\alpha) \notin V_{\text{sing}}([0 \to \mathbb{G}_m]) \)). Hence \( M' = M(\alpha) \). This implies \( M'' = 0 \) and hence \( \psi = 0 \). Then \( \omega = \phi \) vanishes when mapped to \( V^\vee_{dR}([0 \to \mathbb{G}_m]) \). But actually this image is \( dz/z \), so we have a contradiction. \( \square \)

**4.3. Hilbert’s 7th problem**

In his 7th problem Hilbert asked whether it is possible for
\[
\alpha, \beta, \alpha^\beta
\]
all to be algebraic unless \( \alpha = 0, 1 \) or \( \beta \) rational. In other words:
\[
(GS) \quad \alpha, \beta, \alpha^\beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \Rightarrow \alpha = 0, 1 \text{ or } \beta \in \mathbb{Q}.
\]

There is a logarithmic version: let \( \alpha, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^* \), \( \log(\alpha) \) and \( \log(\gamma) \) choices of branches of logarithm.

\[\text{(B)} \quad \log(\alpha) \text{ and } \log(\gamma) \text{ are } \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\text{-linearly dependent} \]
\[\Rightarrow \log(\alpha) \text{ and } \log(\gamma) \text{ are } \mathbb{Q}\text{-linearly dependent} \]

We think of (GS) as the Gelfond-Schneider version of the implication and of (B) as the Baker version.

Note that the converse implication of (B) is obvious. However, the converse implication of (GS) fails in the case \( \alpha = 1 \) if we do not use the principal
branch of logarithm in the definition of $\alpha^\beta$. The problem disappears when restricting to real numbers.

**Lemma 4.3.** The implications (GS) for all $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ and (B) for all $\alpha$ and $\gamma$ are equivalent.

**Proof.** We assume (GS). Let $\alpha, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ such that $\log(\alpha)$ and $\log(\gamma)$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linearly dependent. By assumption there are $u, v \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ such that

$$u \log(\alpha) + v \log(\gamma) = 0.$$ 

Without loss of generality $\alpha \neq 1$. Indeed, if $\alpha = 1$ and $\log(\alpha) = 2\pi n$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we consider instead $\alpha = \gamma$ and different branches of $\log(\gamma)$.

Put $\beta = u/v$. Hence $\alpha^\beta = \exp(\beta(\log(\alpha))) = \gamma^{-1} \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$. By (GS) this implies $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Conversely, we assume that (B). Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\alpha \neq 0, 1$ and $\gamma = \alpha^\beta$. Hence

$$\log(\gamma) = \beta \log(\alpha) + 2\pi in$$

for some choice of logarithm and an appropriate $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We replace the choice of branch of logarithm for $\gamma$ such that $n = 0$. Hence $\log(\gamma)$ and $\log(\alpha)$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linearly dependent. By (B) this implies $\beta \in \mathbb{Q}$. $\square$

**Theorem 4.4 (Gelfond-Schneider).** Implication (B) holds true.

**Proof.** We switch notation from (B) and write $\beta$ instead of $\gamma$. We fix $\alpha, \beta \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ and branches of logarithm $\log(\alpha)$, $\log(\beta)$ such that the numbers are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linearly dependent, hence there are $a, b \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}^*$ such that

$$a \log(\alpha) + b \log(\beta) = 0.$$ 

We want to show that they are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly dependent. We consider the 1-motive $M = [\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{G}_m^2]$ with structure morphism $1 \to (\alpha, \beta)$. The motive is split if both $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are roots of unity. In this case $\log(\alpha)$ and $\log(\beta)$ are rational multiples of $2\pi i$, hence linearly dependent. We exclude this case from now on.

Similar to the case of transcendence of logarithms we have $M^h = \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{G}_m$ and hence $V_{\text{dR}}(M) = \text{coLie}(M^h)$ has the basis $(dt, 0, 0), (0, dz_1/z_1, 0), (0, 0, dz_2/z_2)$. We put $\omega = (0, adz_1/z_1, bdz_2/z_2)$.

We identify $T_{\text{sing}}(M)$. As $M$ is non-split, it is a subset of $\text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m^2)^{\text{an}}$. Recall that $\log(\alpha)\frac{dz_1}{dz_1} = I(\gamma(\alpha))$ where $\gamma(\alpha)$ is a suitable path in $\mathbb{G}_m^{\text{an}}$ from 1 to $\alpha$. The same relation holds for $\beta$. Let $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{G}_m^{\text{an}} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{\text{an}}$ be given by $\gamma(t) = (\gamma(\alpha)(t), \gamma(\beta)(t))$ and put $\sigma = I(\gamma) \in T_{\text{sing}}(M) \subset \text{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_m^2)^{\text{an}}$. By construction

$$\omega(\sigma) = \int_{\gamma(\alpha)} \frac{dz_1}{z_1} + \int_{\gamma(\beta)} \frac{dz_2}{z_2} = a \log(\alpha) + b \log(\beta) = 0.$$ 

By Theorem 3.6 there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0$$
such that $\sigma$ is induced from $M_1$ and $\omega$ from $M_2$. We have $M_2 = [\mathbb{Z}^s \to \mathbb{G}_m^t]$ with $s \leq 1$ and $t \leq 2$.

If $t = 2$, then the surjection $M \to M_2$ is the identity on the torus part. The push-forward of $\sigma$ is given by $(\log(\alpha) \frac{d}{dx_1}, \log(\beta) \frac{d}{dx_2})$. Hence both vanish. This implies that $\alpha = \beta = 1$, a case we had excluded.

The case $t = 0$ is excluded because $\omega$ is not a pull-back from a motive of the form $[\mathbb{Z}^s \to G_m]$. Hence $t = 1$. The torus part of the map $M \to M_2$ is given by $(x, y) \to x^n y^m$ for $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$. The induced map on Lie algebras maps $(\frac{d}{dt}, \log(\alpha) \frac{d}{dx_1}, \log(\beta) \frac{d}{dx_2})$ to $(n \log(\alpha) + m \log(\beta)) \frac{d}{dz}$. This image vanishes, given the linear dependence we were looking for. □

The above is a motivic reformulation of Gelfond’s proof based on $G_m \times G_m$. In contrast, Schneider’s argument using $G_a \times G_m$ does not have a translation to our language. One would need a modification of the analytic subgroup theorem.

The same arguments also apply with more than 2 numbers and give:

**Theorem 4.5 (Baker).** Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. If $\log(\alpha_1), \ldots, \log(\alpha_n)$ are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linearly dependent, then they are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly dependent.

We have

$$\text{rk}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)_\mathbb{Z} = \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}(\log(\alpha_1), \ldots, \log(\alpha_n), 2\pi i/2\pi i)$$

for any choice of branches of logarithms.

**Remark 4.6.** In the literature we often find formulations with $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}$. The above is the correct version that also allows roots of unity or even repetitions with different choices of branch of logarithm. We will discuss later (see Section 9.3) in more detail that the space of periods of the third kind with respect to non-closed paths is only well-defined up to other types of periods.

### 4.4. Abelian periods for closed paths

**Corollary 4.7 (Wüstholz [Wü87]).** Let $A$ be an abelian variety, $\omega \in \Omega^1(A)$ and $\gamma$ a closed path on $A^{an}$. Then

$$\int_\gamma \omega$$

is either 0 or transcendental.

**Proof.** Consider $M = [0 \to A]$. Its de Rham realisation is $\text{coLie}(A^1)^{A^1} \supset \text{coLie}(A)^A$. All global differential forms on $A$ are $A$-invariant, hence $\omega$ defines an element of $V^{\text{dr}}_{\text{dR}}(M)$. It singular realisation is by definition the kernel of $\exp_A : \text{Lie}(A)^{an} \to A^{an}$. Let $\sigma \in V_{\text{sing}}^{\text{dR}}(A)$ be the element such that the image of a path from 0 to $\sigma$ under $\exp_A$ is equal to $\gamma$. Then

$$\int_\sigma \omega = \int_\gamma \omega.$$
Assume that the period is algebraic. We apply Theorem 3.9. Hence $\omega = \phi + \psi$ with $\int_\sigma \psi = 0$ and $\phi$ in the kernel of the restriction to the group part of $M$. But $M$ is equal to its group part, hence $\phi = 0$. □
CHAPTER 5

On non-closed elliptic periods

We are now going to compute the dimension of the space of periods for a non-classical elliptic 1-motive. It is includes the first examples of periods whose transcendence was unknown. At this point everything will be formulated in terms of 1-motives. For the translation to periods of the first, second and third kind, see Chapter 8 and Chapter 10.

The dimension formula is a special case of the generalised Baker Theorem 9.2. We give a direct proof that should be understood as a warm-up for the general case. The result will not be needed later on, but the method is the same.

5.1. The setting

Let \( A = E \) be an elliptic curve, \( 0 \to \mathbb{G}_m \to G \to E \to 0 \) a non-trivial extension (which is even non-split up to isogeny) and \( P \in G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \) a point whose image in \( E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \) is not torsion. We consider

\[
M = [\mathbb{Z} \to G]
\]

with 1 mapping to \( P \).

5.2. Without CM

Assume \( \text{End}(E) = \mathbb{Z} \).

**Proposition 5.1.** Let \( M \) be as just described. Then

\[
\delta(M) = 11.
\]

**Direct proof.** We start by picking bases in singular and de Rham cohomology respecting the weight filtration. Consider inclusions

\[
[0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \hookrightarrow [0 \to G] \hookrightarrow M
\]

with cokernels \([0 \to E]\) and \([\mathbb{Z} \to 0]\), respectively. This leads to the filtration

\[
V_{\text{sing}}(\mathbb{G}_m) \subset V_{\text{sing}}(G) \subset V_{\text{sing}}(M).
\]

Let \( \sigma \) be a basis of \( V_{\text{sing}}(\mathbb{G}_m) \), extend by \( \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \) to a basis of \( V_{\text{sing}}(G) \) and by \( \lambda \) to a basis of the whole space. Then their images \( \tilde{\gamma}_1, \tilde{\gamma}_2 \) in \( E \) form a basis of \( V_{\text{sing}}(E) \) and \( \tilde{\lambda} \) a basis of \( V_{\text{sing}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0]) \).

In the converse direction, consider the projections

\[
M \twoheadrightarrow [\mathbb{Z} \to E] \twoheadrightarrow [\mathbb{Z} \to 0]
\]
with kernels $[0 \to \mathbb{G}_m]$ and $[0 \to E]$, respectively leading to a filtration

$$V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M) \supset V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([\mathbb{Z} \to E]) \supset V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0]).$$

Let $u$ be a basis of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0])$, extend by $\omega, \eta$ to a basis of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}([\mathbb{Z} \to E])$ and by $\xi$ to a basis of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M)$. Then $\tilde{\omega}, \tilde{\eta}$ are a basis of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(E)$ and $\tilde{\xi}$ is a basis of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{G}_m)$. The space $P(M)$ is spanned by the numbers obtained by pairing our basis vectors.

When pairing an element of $V^\text{sing}_{\text{dR}}(M)$ coming from a subobject with an element of $V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M)$ coming from the quotient, we get zero. The two inclusions above give $u(\sigma) = \omega(\sigma) = u(\gamma_1) = u(\gamma_2) = \omega(\sigma) = 0$. Note that $u(\lambda) = 1$ and $\xi(\sigma) = 2\pi i$ (at least after scaling). This gives a period matrix of the shape

$$\begin{pmatrix}
2\pi i & \xi(\gamma_1) & \xi(\gamma_2) & \xi(\lambda) \\
0 & \omega(\gamma_1) & \omega(\gamma_2) & \omega(\lambda) \\
0 & \eta(\gamma_1) & \eta(\gamma_2) & \eta(\lambda) \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix}$$

It remains to show that all entries are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linearly independent. If not, there is a relation

$$a2\pi i + \sum_{i=1}^{2}(b_i\xi(\gamma_i) + c_i\omega(\gamma_i) + d_i\eta(\gamma_i)) + e\xi(\lambda) + f\omega(\lambda) + g\eta(\lambda) + h = 0.$$

We consider the motive

$$\tilde{M} = [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \times [0 \to G]^2 \times M$$

and

$$\tilde{\gamma} = (\sigma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \lambda) \in V^\text{sing}_{\text{dR}}(\tilde{M}),$$

$$\tilde{\omega} = (a\xi, b_1\xi + c_1\omega + d_1\eta, b_2\xi + c_2\omega + d_2\eta, e\xi + f\omega + g\eta + hu) \in V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(\tilde{M}).$$

Then $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{\gamma}) = 0$. By the analytic subgroup theorem for 1-motives, Theorem 2.46, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M_1 \to \tilde{M} \to M_2 \to 0$$

with $\tilde{\gamma}$ induced from $M_1$ and $\tilde{\omega}$ induced from $M_2$. Let $A_2$ be the abelian part of $M_2$. Assume $A_2 \neq 0$. Consider a non-zero $\kappa_2 : A_2 \to E$. Let $L_\kappa = \kappa_2(L_2)$.

By composition, we get a non-zero

$$\kappa : \tilde{M} \to M_2 \to [L_\kappa \to E].$$

Note that $L_\kappa \subset \mathbb{Z}$, hence there are only two possibilities: $L_\kappa = 0$ or $L_\kappa = \mathbb{Z}$. We consider the abelian part of $\kappa$. It is of the form

$$\kappa_E : 0 \times E^3 \to E,$$

hence given by a vector $(0, n, m, k)$ of integers. Note that this is the place where we are using that $E$ does not have CM. The image $L_\kappa$ of $\tilde{L} = 0^3 \times L$ is $kL$. Hence $L_\kappa \neq 0$ if and only if $k \neq 0$. We have

$$0 = \kappa_\ast \tilde{\gamma} = n\gamma_1 + m\gamma_2 + k\lambda \in V^\text{sing}_{\text{dR}}([L_\kappa \to E]).$$
The elements $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ (and if $k \neq 0$ also $\lambda$) are linearly independent in $V_{\text{sing}}([L_\kappa \to E])$, hence $n = m = k = 0$. This contradicts the non-triviality of $\kappa$. Hence $A_2 = 0$.

We now consider $T_2 \cong \mathbb{G}_m^r$. The group part of $\tilde{M} \to M_2$ reads

$$\theta : \mathbb{G}_m \times G^3 \to \mathbb{G}_m^r.$$ 

By assumption, $G$ is non-split, hence the component maps $G \to \mathbb{G}_m^r$ have to vanish. This implies $r \leq 1$ with $\theta = (\cdot, 0, 0, 0)$ either 0 or the projection to the factor $\mathbb{G}_m$. This gives us a lot of information on $\tilde{\omega}$. Recall that $\tilde{\omega} = p^* \omega_2$ for some $\omega_2 \in V_{\text{dR}}^r(M_2)$. We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{CD}
\mathbb{G}_m \times G^3 @>\theta>> \mathbb{G}_m^r \\
@. @VVV \\
\tilde{M} @>>> M_2
\end{CD}$$

Hence the pull-back of $\tilde{\omega}$ to $V_{\text{dR}}^r(\mathbb{G}_m \times G^3)$ is concentrated in the first component. Hence

$$b_1 \xi + c_1 \omega + d_1 \eta = 0$$
$$b_2 \xi + c_2 \omega + d_2 \eta = 0$$
$$e \xi + f \omega + g \eta = 0$$

As the three classes $\xi, \omega, \eta$ are linearly independent, we get vanishing coefficients

$$b_1 = b_2 = c_1 = c_2 = d_1 = d_2 = e = f = g = 0.$$ 

We are now reduced to $\tilde{\omega} = (a \xi, 0, 0, h \eta)$. If $a \neq 0$, then from the period relation also $h \neq 0$. As $\tilde{\omega} = p^* \omega_2$ this implies that the group part of $\tilde{M} \to M_2$ is projection to the first factor and $M_2 = \mathbb{G}_m \times [Z \to 0]$. The kernel $M_1$ is equal to $0 \times G^3$. However, $\tilde{\gamma}$ is induced from $M_1$, hence of the form $(0, \ldots)$. This contradicts $\sigma \neq 0$. Hence we must have $a = 0$ and $h = 0$. 

5.3. CM-case

Assume $\text{End}(E)_Q = Q(\tau)$. This is an imaginary quadratic extension of $Q$.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $M$ be as just described. Then

$$\delta(M) = 9.$$ 

**Direct proof.** We go through the proof in the non-CM case and make the necessary changes. Let $\sigma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \lambda$ be as before. We choose a little more carefully $\gamma_2 = \tau_s \gamma_1$. We then have

$$\omega(\gamma_2) = \omega(\tau_s \gamma_1) = (\tau^s \omega)(\gamma_1) = a \omega(\gamma_1) + b \eta(\gamma_1)$$
$$\eta(\gamma_2) = \eta(\tau_s \gamma_1) = (\tau^s \eta)(\gamma_1) = c \omega(\gamma_1) + d \eta(\gamma_1)$$
for $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Q}$. Indeed, $\tau^*\omega = \tau\omega$ and $\tau^*\eta = \bar{\tau}\eta + c\omega$; but we do not need the special shape. Note that the argument does not apply to $\xi(\gamma_2)$ because $\tau^*\xi$ is not defined.

It remains to show that $2\pi i, \xi(\gamma_1), \omega(\gamma_1), \eta(\gamma_1), \xi(\gamma_2), \xi(\lambda), \omega(\lambda), \eta(\lambda), 1$ are linearly independent. If not, there is a linear relation as in the first case, but omitting the summands for $\omega(\gamma_2)$ and $\eta(\gamma_2)$, so $c_2 = d_2 = 0$. We consider the motive

$$\tilde{M} = [0 \to \mathbb{G}_m] \times [0 \to G] \times M$$

and $\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\omega}$ analogously to before. Again this gives $M_1, M_2$. Assume $A_2 \neq 0$. Choose $\kappa_2, L_\kappa, \kappa$ as in the first case. The composition

$$\tilde{A} = 0 \times E^2 \to E$$

is now given by a vector $(0, n, k)$ of elements of $\text{End}(E) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\tau)$. The rest of the argument goes through from here. \qed
Part 2

Periods of algebraic varieties
CHAPTER 6

Comparison of periods of motives

We give alternative characterisations of the set of periods of 1-motives as periods of the first cohomology of algebraic varieties.

We fix the ground field $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, the algebraic closure of $\mathbb{Q}$, and an embedding $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

6.1. Spaces of cohomological 1-periods

We consider triples $(X,Y,i)$ where $X$ is a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-variety, $Y$ a closed subvariety and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $H^i_{\text{dR}}(X,Y)$ be its relative de Rham cohomology (see [HMS17] Section 3.2) and for the smooth case also Appendix [D.1] and $H^i_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q})$ its relative singular cohomology. The first is a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-vector space, the second a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space. After base change to the complex numbers they become naturally isomorphic via the period isomorphism $\phi$ (see [HMS17] Section 5.4). In good cases, it can be explicitly described as integration of closed differential forms over singular cycles.

Recall the category $(\overline{\mathbb{Q}},\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$, see Chapter [1].

**Definition 6.1.** For algebraic varieties $X \supset Y$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we denote $\mathcal{P}(X,Y,i)\in (\overline{\mathbb{Q}},\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$ the triple $(H^i_{\text{dR}}(X,Y), H^i_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q}), \phi)$.

The assignment is natural for morphisms of pairs $(X,Y) \rightarrow (X',Y')$. For every triple $X \supset Y \supset Z$ there are connecting morphisms

$$\partial : H^i(Y,Z) \rightarrow H^{i+1}(X,Y)$$

in $(\overline{\mathbb{Q}},\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$.

**Definition 6.2.** Let $H^i(X,Y)$ be as above. The set of period numbers $\mathcal{P}(X,Y,i)$ of $H^i(X,Y)$ is the image of the period pairing

$$H^i_{\text{dR}}(X,Y) \times H^i_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$ 

The set of $i$-periods $\mathcal{P}^i$ is the union of the $\mathcal{P}(X,Y,i)$ for all $X$ and $Y$.

For the purposes of our article, we are mostly interested in the case $i = 1$.

**Example 6.3.** We have $\mathcal{P}^0 = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ because $H^0(X,Y)$ only depends on the connected components of $X$ and $Y$.

**Lemma 6.4.** For all $i$, the set $\mathcal{P}^i$ is a $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-subvector space of $\mathbb{C}$. We have $\mathcal{P}^i \subset \mathcal{P}^{i+1}$.
6. Comparison of periods of motives

Proof. The sum of two periods of $H^i(X, Y)$ and $H^i(X', Y')$ is realised as a period of $H^i(X \cup X', Y \cup Y')$. The set is stable under multiplication by numbers in $\mathbb{Q}$ because $H^i_{\text{dR}}(X, Y)$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-vector space.

We find 1 as a period of $H^1(\mathbb{A}^1, \{0, 1\})$ by integrating the differential form $dt$ over the path $s \mapsto e^{2\pi is}$ on $[0, 1]$. Hence the periods of $H^i(X, Y)$ are contained (actually equal to) in the periods of $H^i_{\text{dR}}(X, Y) \otimes H^1(\mathbb{A}^1, \{0, 1\})$.

6.2. Periods of curve type

Nori showed that every affine algebraic variety admits a filtration by subvarieties defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ such that their relative homology is concentrated in a single degree. This “good filtration” should be seen as an analogue of the skeletal filtration of a simplicial complex or a CW-complex. Indeed, affine algebraic varieties have the homotopy type of a simplicial complex. The surprising insight is the existence of such a filtration by algebraic subvarieties, even over the ground field. This filtration goes into the construction of the category of Nori motives, but it also has immediate consequences for periods. For the general result see [HMS17, Section 11]. We repeat the argument in our case.

Proposition 6.5. In the definition of $P^1$ it suffices to consider $H^1(C, D)$ where $C$ is a smooth affine curve and $D$ a finite collection of points on $C$.

Definition 6.6. We call periods of this form of curve type.

Proof. Consider the periods of $H^1(X, Y)$. By Jouanolou’s trick there is an $\mathbb{A}^n$-torsor $\tilde{X} \to X$ with $\tilde{X}$ affine. Let $\tilde{Y}$ be the preimage of $Y$. By homotopy equivalence we have

$$H^1(X, Y) \cong H^1(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}).$$

Hence we may without loss of generality assume that $X$ is affine. By Nori’s Basic Lemma we find very good filtrations by closed subvarieties

$$X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \cdots \subset X_n = X, \quad Y_0 \subset Y_1 \subset \cdots \subset Y_n = Y$$

with $Y_i \subset X_i$, see [HMS17, Proposition 9.2.3, Corollary 9.2.5]. This means that

1. $X_i \setminus X_{i-1}$ is smooth,
2. either $\dim X_i = i$ and $\dim X_{i-1} = i-1$ or $X_i = X_{i-1}$ of dimension less than $i$,
3. $H^j(X_i, X_{i-1})$ vanishes for $j \neq i$.

and analogously for $Y_i$. The boundary maps in the long exact sequence for the triple $(X_{i+1}, X_i, X_{i-1})$ define a complex

$$C(X_i) = [H^0(X_0) \to H^1(X_1, X_0) \to H^2(X_2, X_2) \to \ldots]$$

whose cohomology in degree $j$ agrees with $H^j(X)$. We put

$$C(X_*, Y_*) = \text{Cone}(C(X_*) \to C(Y_*))[-1].$$
Its cohomology in degree $j$ agrees naturally with $H^j(X,Y)$. In particular, $H^1(X,Y)$ is a subquotient of
\[ C(X_*, Y_*)^1 = C(X_*)^1 \oplus C(Y_*)^0 = H^1(X_1, X_0) \oplus H^0(Y_0). \]
Hence also the periods of $H^1(X,Y)$ are contained in the periods of $H^1(X_1, X_0) \oplus H^0(Y_0)$. The latter are 0-periods and hence also 1-periods.

Hence it suffices to consider the case where $X$ is an affine curve, $Y$ a finite set of points and, in addition, $X \setminus Y$ smooth. By normalisation, we resolve the singularities of $X$. Let $\tilde{X}$ be a normalisation and $\tilde{Y}$ the preimage of $Y$ in $\tilde{X}$. By excision we have
\[ H^1(X,Y) \cong H^1(\tilde{X}, \tilde{Y}). \]
The curve $\tilde{X}$ is smooth and affine. □

**Corollary 6.7.** All elements of $P^1$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combinations of integrals of the form
\[ \int_\gamma \omega \]
where $C$ is a smooth affine curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $\omega \in \Omega^1(C)$ an algebraic 1-form on $C$ (defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$) and $\gamma$ a differentiable path on $C(\mathbb{C})$ which is either closed or has end points defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$.

This is a special case of the identification of normal crossings periods and periods of algebraic varieties, see [HMS17, Theorem 11.4.2]. The case $i = 1$ is easier and we give the proof explicitly.

**Proof.** Given Proposition 6.5, this is about the explicit description of relative singular cohomology and de Rham cohomology. Let $C$ be a smooth affine curve, $Y \subset C$ a finite set of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-points.

By definition (see also Section D.1), algebraic de Rham cohomology of $(C,Y)$ is the cohomology of the complex
\[ \text{Cone}(\Omega^*(C) \to \Omega^*(Y))[-1] = [\Omega^0(C) \to \Omega^1(C) \oplus \Omega^0(Y)] \]
in degrees 0 and 1. Hence every class in $H^i_{\text{dR}}(C,Y)$ is represented by a pair $(\omega, \alpha)$ where $\omega$ is a 1-form and $\alpha : Y(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ is a set-theoretic map. Conversely, every such pair defines a class in relative de Rham cohomology.

For every variety $X$, let $S^\infty_n(X)$ be the group of smooth singular chains on $X(\mathbb{C})$, see [HMS17, Definition 2.2.2]. By [HMS17, Theorem 2.2.5] it can be used to compute singular homology of $X(\mathbb{C})$. Relative homology is then defined as homology of the complex
\[ S^\infty_*(C)/S^\infty_*(Y). \]

Its 1-cycles are represented by $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combinations $\sum n_i \gamma_i$ with smooth maps $\gamma_i : [0,1] \to C(\mathbb{C})$ such that $\partial(\sum n_i \gamma_i) = \sum n_i \gamma_i(1) - \sum n_i \gamma_i(0)$ is an element of $S_0(Y)$. Up to homotopy such a cycle can be replaced by a formal $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of closed cycles and paths with end points in $Y(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. 
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In these explicit terms, the period pairing is given by
\[(\omega, \alpha), \gamma_i) = \alpha(\gamma_i(1)) - \alpha(\gamma_i(0)) + \omega.\]
The first two terms only appear for the non-closed cycles. They are algebraic numbers and can be expressed as periods of $A^1$, namely $\int_{[0,1]} \alpha(\gamma(r)) dt$ for $r = 0, 1$. Hence every element of $P^1$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of explicit periods as claimed. \hfill \Box

Conversely, all periods of curves are in $P^1$.

**Proposition 6.8.** Let $C$ be a curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $Y \subset C$ a finite set of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-points. Then
\[
\mathcal{P}(H^*(C,Y)) \subset P^1.
\]
**Proof.** Consider $H^i(C,Y)$. The assertion holds for $i = 1$ by definition and was shown for $i = 0$. In the case $i = 2$ dimension reasons show that $H^2(C,Y) \cong H^2(C)$. Let $\tilde{C}$ be the normalisation of $C$. By the blow-up sequence $H^2(C) \cong H^2(\tilde{C})$. Without loss of generality, $C$ is connected. We have $H^2(\tilde{C}) = 0$ if $C$ is affine and $H^2(\tilde{C}) \cong H^2(\mathbb{P}^1)$ if $\tilde{C}$ is projective. We have $H^2(\mathbb{P}^1) \cong H^1(\mathbb{G}_m)$, hence its periods are also in $P^1$. \hfill \Box

### 6.3. Comparison with periods of $1$-motives

From a conceptual point of view, it is also important to describe $1$-periods in terms of Jacobians of curves.

Let $C$ be a smooth curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, and $D \subset C$ a finite set of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-points. Let $J(C)$ be its generalised Jacobian (see Appendix B) and $\mathbb{Z}[D]^0 = \{f : D \to \mathbb{Z} | \sum_{P \in D} f(P) = 0\}$ the set of divisors of degree 0 supported in $D$. We consider the $1$-motive
\[
M = [\mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \to J(C)].
\]
If $D \neq \emptyset$, the can use $P_0 \in D$ in order to embed $C$ (and hence $D$) into $J(C)$.

**Lemma 6.9.** In this situation, we have
\[
\mathcal{P}(H^1(C,D)) = \mathcal{P}(H^1(J(C),D)) = \mathcal{P}(M).
\]
**Proof.** Let $D = \{P_0, \ldots, P_r\}$. (The case $D = \emptyset$ is completely parallel, but easier.) We use $P_0$ for the definition of the inclusion $C \to J(C)$ which induces by functoriality
\[
H^1(C,D) \to H^1(J(C),D).
\]
We apply the long exact cohomology sequence. By Theorem B.1, the natural map $H^1(J(C)) \to H^1(C)$ is an isomorphism. Hence the same is true for the $H^1(J(C),D) \to H^1(C,D)$ and so their periods agree.

In the second step, we apply Proposition D.6 to the $1$-motive $M = [\mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \to J(C)]$. Note that $e_i = P_i - P_0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ is a basis of $\mathbb{Z}[D]^0$. \hfill \Box
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and the natural map $D \to J(C)$ maps $P_0$ to 0 and all other $P_i$ to the corresponding $e_i$. Hence Proposition D.6 gives an isomorphism

$$V(M)^\vee = H^1(J(C), D).$$

By the definition of periods, in particular Definition 3.1, this implies

$$\mathcal{P}(M) = \mathcal{P}(H^1(J(C), D)).$$

□

Remark 6.10. There is a subtle point that we would like to stress. For every 1-motive $M$, we defined an object $V(M) \in (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})$-Vect. However, the periods of $M$ in Definition 3.1 are not the periods of $V(M)$—but rather of $V(M)^\vee$. The reason behind this choice of definitions is that 1-motives are really a homological theory, whereas the present section was formulated in cohomological terms. In both cases we prefer to think of de Rham cohomology and singular homology—they are much more natural than the other way around.

Proposition 6.11. A complex number is a period of some 1-motive if and only if it is in $\mathcal{P}^1$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}^1 = \mathcal{P}(1\text{-Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}}).$$

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}^1$. By Proposition 6.5 it is of curve type. By Lemma 6.9 is the period of a 1-motive.

For the converse, let $[L \to G]$ be a 1-motive. Up to isogeny, we can split $L = L_1 \oplus L_2$ with $L_1 \to G$ and $L_2 \to G$. Hence

$$M \cong [L_1 \to 0] \oplus [L_2 \to G].$$

Hence it suffices to consider the two special cases separately. For $M = [\mathbb{Z} \to 0]$, we have by Proposition D.6 that $V(M)^\vee \cong H^0(\text{Spec}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}))$. For $M = [\mathbb{Z}^r \to G]$ we have by Proposition D.6 that $V(M)^\vee \cong H^1(G, Z)$ with $Z = \{0, P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$ where $P_i$ is the image of the $i$-th standard basis vector of $\mathbb{Z}^r$. Their periods are in $\mathcal{P}^1$. □

Remark 6.12. Let us sum up what we have learned: There are three different definitions of what a 1-period might be:

1. the period of some $H^1(X, Y)$ (cohomological degree 1),
2. the period of a curve relative to some points (dimension 1),
3. the period of a Deligne 1-motive.

These three notions agree.

6.4. The motivic point of view

We have avoided talking about mixed motives up to now. This has the advantage of making the arguments much more accessible for readers not familiar with the highly developed and complicated machinery of motives.
On the other hand, the motivic picture gives a lot more structure to the situation. It also shows that most (but not all) formal results on cohomological 1-periods above can easily be deduced from the literature.

Let \( k \) be a field with a fixed embedding into \( \mathbb{C} \). We denote \( \text{DM}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) Voevodsky’s triangulated category of effective geometric motives. Let \( d_1 \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) be the full thick subcategory generated by the motives of the form \( M(X) \) for \( X \) a smooth variety of dimension at most 1.

**Theorem 6.13 (Orgogozo [Org04], Barbieri-Viale, Kahn [BVK16]).** There is a natural equivalence of triangulated categories

\[
D^b(1-\text{Mot}_k) \to d_1 \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q})
\]

from the derived category of the abelian category of iso-1-motives to \( d_1 \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \). The inclusion \( d_1 \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \text{DM}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) has a left adjoint which is a section.

On the other hand, there is Nori’s abelian category \( \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) of effective motives. It is universal for all cohomological functors compatible with rational singular cohomology. See Appendix C for a very brief introduction. Let \( d_1 \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) be the full subcategory closed under subquotients generated by \( H^i(X,Y) \) for \( Y \subset X \) with \( i \leq 1 \). By work of Ayoub and Barbieri-Viale, see Theorem C.7, there is an antiequivalence

\[
1-\text{Mot}_k \to d_1 \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}),
\]

and, moreover, the abelian category \( d_1 \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) has an explicit description as the diagram category in the sense of Nori, see [HMS17, Theorem 7.1.13] of a certain diagram.

The two settings are linked:

**Theorem 6.14 (Nori, Harrer [Har16]).** There is a triangulated functor

\[
\text{DM}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to D^b(\mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}))
\]

compatible with the singular realisation into the derived category of \( \mathbb{Q} \)-vector spaces. It maps \( d_1 \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) to \( D^b(d_1 \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q})) \).

**Proof.** The existence of the functor is due to Harrer, based on a construction of Nori. Let \( C \) be a smooth variety of dimension 0 or 1. Let \( M(C) \) be the corresponding object in \( \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \). Its image in \( D^b(\mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q})) \) has cohomology in degrees at most 2. Cohomology in degree 2 only occurs if \( C \) is a smooth proper curve. In this case

\[
H^2(C) \cong H^2(\mathbb{P}^1) \cong H^1(\mathbb{G}_m),
\]

hence it is also in \( d_1 \mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \). \( \square \)

The universal property of Nori motives implies the existence of a functor

\[
\mathcal{M}_{}^{\text{eff}}\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \twoheadrightarrow \text{MHS}_k \hookrightarrow (k, \mathbb{Q})-\text{Vect},
\]
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see [HMS17, Proposition 10.1.2]. This allows us to define periods for the various categories of motives. We sum up all functors in one diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
D^b(\text{1−Mot}_k) & \cong & d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \\
\text{H}^0 & \cong & \text{H}^0 \\
1\text{−Mot}_k & \cong & \text{MHS}_k \\
\end{array}
\]

Corollary 6.15. The sets of periods of the categories \(1\text{−Mot}_k, d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q})\) and \(d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q})\) agree. In particular, Proposition 6.5 and Proposition 6.11 hold true.

Proof. On the one hand we have the equivalences of categories

\[
D^b(1\text{−Mot}_k) \to d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to D^b(d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q}))
\]

of Theorem 6.13 and Theorem 6.14 combined with Theorem C.7. Moreover, Deligne’s construction of the realisation of a 1-motive agrees (up to duality) with the one via the identification with \(d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q})\), see Proposition D.7. Hence these three categories have identical sets of periods. Moreover, by definition the periods of \(D^b(1\text{−Mot}_k)\) agree with the periods of \(1\text{−Mot}_k\).

By definition, \(\mathcal{P}^1 \subset \mathcal{P}(d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q}))\). By the explicit description \(d_1\mathcal{M}_{\text{eff Nori}}^\text{eff}(k, \mathbb{Q})\) in Theorem C.7 we get the converse inclusion and even the more restrictive description of Proposition 6.5.

As a byproduct, we get \(\mathcal{P}^1 = \mathcal{P}(1\text{−Mot}_k)\), reproving Proposition 6.11.

□
CHAPTER 7

Relations between periods

In the last chapter, we established different descriptions for the space of 1-periods. We now turn to their relations.

7.1. Kontsevich’s period conjecture

There is a short list of obvious relations.

(A) Bilinearity: Let $X$ be a variety over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $Y \subset X$ a closed subvariety, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in H^{i}_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q})$, $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in H^{i}_{\text{dR}}(X,Y)^\vee$, $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then

$$\int_{\mu_1 \sigma_1 + \mu_2 \sigma_2} (\lambda_1 \omega_1 + \lambda_2 \omega_2) = \sum_{i,j=1,2} \mu_i \lambda_j \int_{\sigma_i} \omega_j.$$ 

(B) Functoriality: Let $f : (X,Y) \to (X',Y')$ be a morphism of pairs of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-varieties, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\sigma \in H^{i}_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q})$ and $\omega' \in H^{i}_{\text{dR}}(X',Y')$. Then

$$\int_{\sigma} f^* \omega' = \int_{f_* \sigma} \omega'.$$

(C) Boundary maps: Let $X \supset Y \supset Z$ be subvarieties, $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\sigma \in H^{i+1}_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q})$ and $\omega \in H^{i}_{\text{dR}}(Y,Z)$. Then

$$\int_{\partial \sigma} \omega = \int_{\sigma} \partial \omega$$

where $\partial$ denotes the boundary maps $H^{i}_{\text{dR}}(Y,Z) \to H^{i+1}_{\text{dR}}(X,Y)$ and $H^{i+1}_{\text{sing}}(X,Y;\mathbb{Q}) \to H^{i}_{\text{sing}}(Y,Z;\mathbb{Q})$, respectively.

Recall from Definition 6.2 the set of $i$-periods $\mathcal{P}^i \subset \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathcal{P}^{\text{eff}} = \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty \mathcal{P}^i$ be the set of effective cohomological periods and $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^{\text{eff}}[\pi^{-1}]$ the period algebra.

**Conjecture 7.1** (Period conjecture, Kontsevich [Kon99]). All $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-linear relations between elements of $\mathcal{P}$ are induced by the above relations.

**Remark 7.2.**

- This is not identical to the conjecture originally formulated by Kontsevich in [Kon99]: he was only considering smooth varieties $X$ and divisors with normal crossings $Y$, see the discussion in [HMS17, Remark 13.1.8] for the precise relation. The above version implies that $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{P})$ is a torsor under the motivic Galois group of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. This implication is due to Nori. It was first
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formulated in [Kon99, Theorem]. A complete exposition can be found in [HMS17, Theorem 13.1.4].

- Products of periods are in fact periods on products of varieties. Hence the above conjecture also says something about algebraic relations between periods. Indeed, it is equivalent to a Grothendieck style version of the period conjecture. For a complete discussion, see [HMS17, Section 13.2]. We do not deal with this because we are interested in the set $\mathcal{P}_1$, which is not closed under multiplication.

**Theorem 7.3 (Period conjecture for $\mathcal{P}_1$).** The period conjecture is true for the subset $\mathcal{P}_1$. More explicitly, the following equivalent statements hold true:

1. All relations between periods of 1-motives are induced by bilinearity and functoriality of 1-motives.
2. All relations between periods of curve type are induced by bilinearity and functoriality of pairs $(C, D) \to (C', D')$ with $C, C'$ smooth affine curves and $D, D'$ finite sets of points.
3. All relations between periods in cohomological degree at most 1 are induced by the relations (A), (B), (C).

Note that this theorem does not mention Nori motives. In contrast to Section 6, we have not been able to eliminate them from the proofs, at least not without disproportionate effort.

**Motivic Proof of Theorem 7.3.** Assertion (1) is the contents of Theorem 3.8. Hence it remains to show the equivalence with the others.

The category $\mathcal{1}^{-\text{Mot}}_\mathbb{Q}$ is equivalent to $d_1\mathcal{MM}_{\text{Nori}}^\text{eff}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q})$ by Theorem C.7. This category has a description as the diagram category of the diagram of pairs $(C, D)$ with $C$ a smooth affine curve and $D$ a finite set of points on $D$. By the general results of [HMS17, Theorem 8.4.22] this implies that all relations are induced by bilinearity and functoriality for the edges of the diagram, i.e., functoriality for pairs. This is the implication from Assertion (1) to Assertion (2).

By the proof of Proposition 6.5 all elements in $\mathcal{P}_1$ can be related to periods of curve type using only the operations (A), (B), (C). Hence Assertion (2) implies Assertion (3).

In order to show the implication from Assertion (3) to Assertion (1), we apply Theorem C.7 and replace $\mathcal{1}^{-\text{Mot}}_\mathbb{Q}$ by the equivalent $d_1\mathcal{MM}_{\text{Nori}}^\text{eff}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q})$. Every object $M$ in the latter category is a subquotient of an object of the form $H^i(X, Y)$ for $i \leq 1$. Actually, Theorem C.7 shows that it suffices to take $i = 1$ and $X$ a curve. The functoriality relation for periods of Nori motives identifies the periods of $M$ with the periods of $H^i(X, Y)$ for $i \leq 1$. The relations (B) and (C) are special cases of the functoriality relation for Nori-1-motives. This finishes the proof.

\[ \square \]
We come back to the category of Nori-1-motives and its realisations as discussed in Section 6.4.

**Theorem 7.4.** The three natural functors $f_1, f_2, f_3$ on $1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q}$

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q} & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q})^d \\
& f_1 & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \\
& f_2 & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \\
& f_3 & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \\
& & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Hodge}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \\
& & \mathcal{M}_{\text{Hodge}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \\
& & \mathbb{Q} \text{- Vect}
\end{array}
\]

are fully faithful with image closed under subquotients.

**Proof.** It suffices to consider the total functor $f_3$. Note that it is faithful and exact. Let $M \in 1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q}$. Consider a short exact sequence in $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \text{- Vect}$

\[
0 \to V' \to V(M) \to V'' \to 0.
\]

This implies that the period matrix for $V(M)$ is block-triangular, i.e., contains a square of 0’s. By Theorem 3.6 this implies that $M$ decomposes as an iso-1-motive. Hence $V'$ and $V''$ have to be motivic. To see this, consider $\text{Ann} = \text{Ann}(V'_Q) \subset V_{dR}^\vee(M)$. We have $(V''_Q)^\vee \subset \text{Ann}$. By Theorem 3.6 applied to the elements of $V'_Q$, there is a short exact sequence in $1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q}$

\[
0 \to M' \to M \to M'' \to 0
\]

such that $V_{dR}^\vee(M'') = \text{Ann}$. We have $V''_Q' \subset \ker(V_{\text{sing}}(M) \to V_{\text{sing}}(M'')) = V_{\text{sing}}(M')$. Both $V(M')$ and $V'$ are subobjects of $V(M)$, hence even $V' \subset V(M')$. This implies dually $V(M'') \to V''$ and hence $\text{Ann} = V_{dR}^\vee(M'') \subset (V''_Q)^\vee$. Together this gives $V(M'') = V''$ and $V(M') = V'$.

Let $M, M' \in 1\text{-Mot}$, $f : V(M) \to V(M')$ a morphism in $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \text{- Vect}$. The graph $\Gamma$ of $f$ exists in $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \text{- Vect}$ and is a subobject of $V(M) \times V(M')$. We have established above that $1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q}$ is closed under subquotients in $(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q}) \text{- Vect}$, hence there is $\bar{\Gamma} \subset M \times M'$ such that $V(\bar{\Gamma}) = \Gamma$. The projection $\bar{\Gamma} \to M \times M' \to M$ is an isomorphism because this is true after applying $V$. Hence $\bar{\Gamma}$ is the graph of a morphism of 1-motives. We get it as $M \cong \bar{\Gamma} \to M'$.

**Remark 7.5.** We gave a direct proof for $\mathcal{M}_{\text{Hodge}}(\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q})$ earlier, see Proposition 2.8. Both arguments rely on the analytic subgroup theorem applied to the graph of a morphism, but applied differently.

**Remark 7.6.** Theorem 7.4 is not equivalent to Theorem 7.3. Consider for example the full abelian subcategory $\mathcal{A}$ closed under subquotients of
(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})\text{-}\text{Vect} generated by the single object \( V = (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q}^2, \phi) \) with \( \phi : \mathbb{C}^2 \to \mathbb{C}^2 \) given by multiplication by the matrix

\[
\Phi = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & \pi \\
\log(2) & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

It is easy to check that \( V \) is simple and that the only endomorphisms are given by multiplication by rational numbers. Indeed, a subobject \( V' \subseteq V \) is given by a vector \( v = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Q}^2 \) such that \( \phi(v) = \begin{pmatrix} a + \pi b \\ \log(2) a + b \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{Q}^2 \).

As \( \pi \) and \( \log(2) \) are transcendental, this implies \( b = a = 0 \). An endomorphism \( f : V \to V \) is given by a pair of matrices \( A_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \) on \( V_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \) and \( A_\mathbb{Q} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \) on \( V_\mathbb{Q} \) such that \( \Phi A_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} = A_{\mathbb{Q}} \Phi \). This amounts to

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\alpha + \pi \gamma \\
\log(2) \alpha + \gamma
\end{pmatrix} 
\begin{pmatrix}
\beta + \pi \delta \\
\log(2) \beta + \delta
\end{pmatrix} = 
\begin{pmatrix}
a + b \log(2) \\
c + d \log(2)
\end{pmatrix}
\begin{pmatrix}
a \pi + b \\
c \pi + d
\end{pmatrix}
\]

By the \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear independence of \( 1, \pi, \log(2) \) this implies \( \gamma = b = 0, \alpha = a, \delta = a, \beta = b, \alpha = d, \gamma = c, \beta = c = 0, d = \delta \).

Hence \( A_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} = A_\mathbb{Q} \) is a diagonal matrix for \( a \in \mathbb{Q} \).

The space of periods of \( V \) has \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-dimension 3 with basis \( 1, \pi, \log(2) \). On the other hand, the bilinearity relations imply that the space of formal periods of \( V \) is generated by 4 elements. There are no additional relations coming from subobjects or endomorphisms. The period conjecture implies that \( \Phi \) does not occur as the period matrix of a 1-motive, even though all entries are indeed in \( \mathbb{P}^1 \).

**Remark 7.7.** The implication from the period conjecture to Theorem 7.4 is a special case of a general pattern, see the discussion in \([\text{HMS17}, \text{Proposition 13.2.8}]\), where also the relation between the period conjecture and the Hodge conjecture is explained. This is also taken up by Andreatta, Barbieri-Vialle and Bertapelle in their recent work, \([\text{ABVB18}]\). They give an independent proof of Theorem 7.4.

### 7.2. The case of curves

The case of curves is of particular interest.

#### 7.2.1. Motivating examples

In his book on transcendental numbers \([\text{Sie49}]\), Siegel mentioned several problems which were not accessible at the time. He wrote (see loc. cit. p. 97)

*All our transcendency proofs made essential use of the fact that the problem can be reduced to the proof of a property of entire functions. This is the*
reason why the known methods do not work for elliptic integrals of the third kind and not even for integrals of the third kind in the still simpler fact of curves of genus 0. For instance, it is not known whether the number
\[ \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{1 + x^3} = \frac{1}{3}(\log 2 + \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}) \]
is irrational.
This is what we call an incomplete period of the third kind on \( \mathbb{P}^1 \). That this number is even transcendental follows from Baker’s work on linear forms in logarithms. Indeed one deduces from the inhomogenous case of Baker’s theorem that the numbers 1, \( \log 2 \) and \( \pi = -i \log(-1) \) are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Strictly speaking this is not a transcendence result but a result on linear independence of incomplete periods of the third kind in the case of a curve of genus 0. However the transcendence of \( \log 2 \) and \( \pi = -i \log(-1) \) is an immediate consequence.

A. van der Poorten, see [VdP71] considered a more general complete and also incomplete period of the third kind on a curve of genus 0. Note that a differential \( \xi \) of the third kind in this case takes the form
\[ \xi = \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \,dx \]
where \( P(x) \) and \( Q(x) \) are polynomials. He considers a path \( \gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{P}^1 \) along which the differential form is defined and which satisfies \( \gamma(0), \gamma(1) \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{Q}) \). Denote by \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n \) the zeroes of \( Q \) and \( r_1, \ldots, r_n \) the residues at the poles of the differential form \( \xi \). Then he deduces again from the inhomogenous version of Baker’s theorem on linear forms in logarithms that \( \int_{\gamma} \xi \) is algebraic if and only
\[ \int_{\gamma} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{r_k}{x - \alpha_k} \right) dx = 0. \]
This follows from taking the partial fraction decomposition
\[ \frac{P(x)}{Q(x)} \,dx = dF(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{r_k}{x - \alpha_k} \,dx. \]
In Theorem 7.10 below we will give a generalisation of van der Poorten’s result to curves of any genus. In particular van der Poorten’s Theorem is a special case of our result. Furthermore in the case of positive genus this includes abelian integrals of the third kind and proves transcendence of complete and incomplete periods.

An even older example was pointed out by Arnol’d in [Arn90]. He gives a reference to a letter of Leibniz to Huygens, dated 10 April 1691. In this letter Leibniz formulated the problem of transcendence of the areas of segments cut off from an algebraic curve, defined by an equation with rational coefficients, by straight lines with algebraic coefficients (see [Arn90, p. 93, footnote]). In [Arn90, p. 105] Arnol’d reformulated this problem
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turning it into modern language: an abelian integral along an algebraic curve with rational (algebraic) coefficients taken between limits which are rational (algebraic) numbers is generally a transcendental number. Again Theorem 7.10 below gives the solution to Leibniz’ problem. We refer to Wüstenstahl for a more detailed discussion of the example.

7.2.2. The period conjecture for curves.

**Theorem 7.8.** Let $C$ be a smooth curve over $\mathbb{Q}$, $D \subset C$ a finite set of $\mathbb{Q}$-points. Then all relations between periods of $H^1(C, D)$ are induced by bilinearity and morphisms between subquotients of sums of the 1-motive $[L \to J(C)]$ where $J(C)$ is the generalised Jacobian and $L = \mathbb{Z}[D]^0$ is the group of divisors of degree 0 supported in $D$.

**Proof.** By Lemma 6.9, the periods of $H^1(C, D)$ agree with the periods of the 1-motive as described in the theorem. We then apply Theorem 3.8. □

**Remark 7.9.** Note that this version of the period conjecture does not rely on the higher theory of geometric or Nori motives — only 1-motives are used. This version is actually a lot more useful in computations.

We now concentrate on the periods of differential forms. It suffices to consider the case of a smooth projective curve $C$. For $f \in \mathbb{Q}(C)$ we have the meromorphic differential form $\omega = df$. Choose a path $\gamma$ in $C^{an}$ avoiding the singularities of $f$ and with beginning and end point in $C(\mathbb{Q})$. Then

$$\int_{\gamma} \omega = f(\gamma(1)) - f(\gamma(0)) \in \mathbb{Q}. $$

This is essentially the only way to produce algebraic periods from meromorphic differential forms.

**Theorem 7.10 (Transcendence of periods).** Let $C$ be a smooth projective curve over $\mathbb{Q}$ and $\omega$ a meromorphic differential form defined over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \gamma_i$ where $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \to C$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ are differentiable paths avoiding the poles of $\omega$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We assume that $\partial \sigma$ has support in $C(\mathbb{Q})$. We consider

$$\alpha = \int_{\sigma} \omega.$$ 

Then $\alpha$ is algebraic if and only if $\omega$ is the sum of an exact form and a form with vanishing period.

**Remark 7.11.**
• This includes famous cases like the transcendence of $\pi$, $\log(\alpha)$ (for $\alpha$ algebraic) and periods and quasi-periods of elliptic curves.
• Periods of the first, second and third kind are allowed.

**Proof.** Let $C^\circ \subset C$ be an affine curve such that $\omega$ is holomorphic on $C^\circ$. Let $D \subset C^\circ$ be the set of starting and end points of the $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$. We can then interpret $\alpha$ as a period on $H^1(C^\circ, D)$. Put $G = J(C^\circ)$ the generalised Jacobian of $C^\circ$ and fix $C^\circ \to G$. We translate $\alpha$ into a period
of the 1-motive $M = [\mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \to G]$ by viewing $[\omega] \in H^1_{dR}(C^\circ, D)$ as an element of $V_{dR}(M)$ and $[\sigma] \in H^1_{\text{sing}}(C^\circ, D; \mathbb{Q})$ as an element of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$. By Theorem 3.9 this implies that $\omega = \phi + \psi$ such that $\int_{\sigma} \psi = 0$ and the image of $\phi$ in $V_{dR}(G)^\vee = H^1_{dR}(G) \cong H^1_{dR}(C^\circ)$ vanishes. As $C^\circ$ is affine, this means that the differential form $\phi \in \Omega^1(C^\circ)$ is exact. \qed
CHAPTER 8

Vanishing of periods of curves

We now turn to the subtle question of the vanishing of period integrals on curves.

In the following discussion fix the following data:

- $C$ a smooth projective curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with distinguished base point $P_0 \in C(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$,
- $\omega \in \Omega^1 \mathbb{Q}(C)$ a meromorphic differential form,
- $C^\circ \subset C$ the complement of the set of poles $S = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_m\}$ of $\omega$ (without loss of generality $P_0 \notin S$),
- $J(C)$ and $J(C^\circ)$ the (generalised) Jacobians of $C$ and $C^\circ$ with embeddings $\nu^\circ : C^\circ \to J(C^\circ)$, $\nu : C \to J(C)$ via $P \mapsto P - P_0$,
- $\sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \gamma_i$ a formal $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of $C^\circ$-paths $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \to C^\circ$ with endpoints defined over $\mathbb{Q}$.
- Let $D \subset C^\circ$ be a set of points such that $\sigma$ defines an element $[\sigma]$ of $H^1_{\text{sing}}(C^\circ, D; \mathbb{Q})$. We define $r = |D| - 1$ if $D \neq \emptyset$ and $r = 0$ if $D = \emptyset$.
- The form $\omega$ defines an element $[\omega]$ of $H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^\circ, D)$, see Section D.1 (17). It vanishes if $\omega = df$ for a rational function $f \in \mathbb{Q}(C)$ that vanishes in $D$.

We are going to determine necessary and sufficient conditions for the vanishing of the period

$$\alpha = \int_\sigma \omega \in \mathbb{C}.$$ 

Its properties depend on the 1-motive

$$M = [L \to J(C^\circ)]$$

where $L = \mathbb{Z}[D]^0$ is the group of divisors of degree 0 supported on $D$. It has rank $r$. By Lemma 6.3, we have

$$V_{\text{sing}}(M) \cong H^1_{\text{sing}}(C^\circ, D; \mathbb{Q}), \ V_{\text{dR}}(M) \cong H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^\circ, D)$$

and $\alpha$ can be viewed as a period of $M$.

Recall the map $I$ from Section 1.2 which assigns to a path or more generally a chain in a complex Lie group an element of the complex Lie algebra. Given a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \to C^\circ$, we put

$$l(\gamma) = I(\nu^\circ \circ \gamma) \in \text{Lie}(J(C^\circ))^\text{an}.$$ 

It has the property that

$$\exp(l(\gamma)) = \gamma(1) - \gamma(0) =: P(\gamma) \in J(C^\circ)^\text{an},$$

65
hence should be seen as a choice of logarithm. Let
\[ l(\sigma) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \lambda(\gamma_i). \]
Hence
\[ \exp(l(\sigma)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i P(\gamma_i) =: P(\sigma). \]

**Definition 8.1.** We say that \( \alpha \) vanishes *trivially* if \( [\sigma] = 0 \) in \( H^1_{\text{sing}}(C^\circ, D) \) or \( [\omega] = 0 \) in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^\circ, D) \). We say that it vanishes *non-trivially* if \( \alpha = 0 \) but \([\sigma] \neq 0, [\omega] \neq 0 \).

Note that \( \omega \in H^0(C, \Omega^1_C) \) is a non-vanishing global differential form without poles. This means that \( C^\circ = C \). The class of \( \omega \) in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D) \) and even in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C) \) is non-zero because differential forms of the first kind cannot be exact. There can be non-trivial vanishing if the Jacobian \( J(C) \) is non-simple and \( \omega = p^*\omega_2 \) whereas \( \sigma = \iota_*\sigma_1 \). So let us assume, in addition, that \( J(C) \) is simple. One may now ask in this case if there is additional non-trivial vanishing.

The submotives of \( M \) are either of the form \( [L_1 \to J(C)] \) or \( [L_1 \to 0] \) for \( L_1 \subset \mathbb{Z} \). Assume that \( M_1 = [L_1 \to J(C)] \). By assumption, \([\omega]\) is a pull-back from \( M_2 \), hence its pull-back to \([L_1 \to J(C)]\) vanishes and then also its restriction to \([0 \to J(C)]\). This is equivalent to \([\omega] = 0 \) in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C) \). For differential forms of the first kind this implies \( \omega = 0 \). This case does not occur.

Otherwise \( M_1 = [L_1 \to 0] \subset M \). Then the structure map \( L_1 \to J(C) \) is isogenous to the zero map and \( \sigma = \iota_*(\sigma_1) \). In concrete terms,
\[ P(\sigma) = \exp(l(\sigma)) =: \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i P(\gamma_i) \in J(C) \]
is a torsion point. This is a necessary, but not sufficient condition for non-trivial vanishing. Let \( n \geq 1 \) be such that the image \( L_0 \) of \( L \) under the composition \( L \to J(C) \xrightarrow{[n]} J(C) \) is torsion free. We put \( M_0 = [L_0 \to J(C)] \). By construction, \([n]\) defines a morphism of 1-motives \( M \to M_0 \) and \( M_1 \) is contained in its kernel. The image of \( \sigma \) is zero in \( T_{\text{sing}}(M_0) \) and hence \([n]_*l(\sigma) = 0 \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C)^{\text{an}}) \). The map \([n]_* \) is multiplication by \( n \).
on Lie($J(C)^{an}$), hence $[n]_l(\sigma) = 0$ implies $l(\sigma) = 0$. The image of $l(\sigma)$ in $J(C)^{an}$ is $P(\sigma)$, and we conclude that $P(\sigma)$ is not only a torsion point, but 0, i.e., the points $P(\gamma_i)$ are linearly dependent in $J(C)$.

Conversely, let $\sigma$ with $l(\sigma) = 0$. We put $L_1 = \mathbb{Z}$ mapping to $L = \mathbb{Z}[D]^0$ by mapping 1 to $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(\gamma_i(1) - \gamma_i(0)) \in \mathbb{Z}[D]^0$. Then $M_1 = [L_1 \to 0] \to [L \to J(C)^{an}]$ is well-defined and $[\sigma]$ induced from a class on $M_1$. The morphism of motives induces a morphism of Hodge structures, in particular it respects the Hodge filtration. We have $\omega \in H^0(C, \Omega^1) = F^1H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D) = F^1V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M)$. Hence the pull-back of $\omega$ to $M_1$ is also in $F^1V^\vee_{\text{dR}}(M_1) = 0$. We have non-trivial vanishing.

**Summary 8.2.** Let $J(C)$ simple, $\omega$ of the first kind. Then $\int_{\sigma} \omega$ vanishes non-trivially if and only if $l(\sigma) = 0$.

**Remark 8.3.** This looks like trivial vanishing—but it is not. The class $[\sigma] \in H^1_{\text{sing}}(C, D; \mathbb{Q})$ is not in the image of $H^1_{\text{sing}}(C, \mathbb{Q})$. Rather there is a projection defined only via the Jacobian. The image of $[\sigma]$ under this projection vanishes.

### 8.2. Exact forms

Consider $\omega = df$ such that $f$ does not vanish identically on $D$. Then $[\omega] \neq 0$ in $H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D)$. The period integral is

$$
\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(f(\gamma_i(1)) - f(\gamma_i(0))).
$$

This is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of algebraic numbers. It can vanish, and will.

**Example 8.4.**

1. Let $E = V(Y^2 Z = X(X - Z)(X - aZ)) \subset \mathbb{P}^2$ for $\alpha \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ be an elliptic curve. Consider $\omega = dX$. This is an exact form. For every $x \in \mathbb{Q}$ we get a point $P_x$ in $E(\mathbb{Q})$ with $X(P_x) = x \in \mathbb{Q}$. For any choice of $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in \mathbb{Q}$, there are coefficients $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\sum a_i x_i = 0$. Let $\gamma_i$ be a path from $P_0$ to $P_{x_i}$ and $\sigma = \sum a_i \gamma_i$. Then $\int_{\sigma} dX = 0$.

2. Let $C$ be a smooth projective curve and $f \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}(C)$ not constant. We view it as a non-constant morphism $f : C \to \mathbb{P}^1$. Let $x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$, $y_0, y_1 \in f^{-1}(x)$, and $\gamma$ a path from $y_0$ to $y_1$ in $C^{an}$. Then $\int_{\gamma} df = f(y_1) - f(y_0) = x - x = 0$.

In terms of 1-motives, we have $M_1 = [L_1 \to J(C)]$, $M_2 = [L_2 \to 0]$.

**Summary 8.5.** If $\omega = df$, then we have non-trivial vanishing if

$$
\sum_{i=1}^n a_i(f(\gamma_i(1)) - f(\gamma_i(0))) = 0.
$$
8.3. Forms of the second kind

Assume that \( \omega \) has a non-empty set of poles, but no residues. Assume that \( \omega \) is not exact. A priori \( [\omega] \in H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^o, D) \), but it is in the kernel of the residue map \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^o, D) \to H^0_{\text{dR}}(S)(-1) \), hence it actually defines a cohomology class of \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D) \). As in the case of forms of the first kind, we have to consider \( M = [L \to J(C)] \). Again there is non-trivial vanishing if \( J(C) \) is non-simple. Assume from now on that \( J(C) \) is simple.

Consider non-trivial vanishing induced from a submotive \( M_1 \). With the same argument as for \( \omega \) of the first kind, the case \( M_1 = [L_1 \to J(C)] \) leads to \( \omega = df \) with \( f \) not identically zero on \( D \). This is the case treated in Section 8.2.

If \( M_1 = [L_1 \to 0] \), then the same arguments as for periods of the first kind imply \( l(\sigma) = 0 \). However, this is no longer sufficient. There is also a condition on \( \omega \). In order to analyse it, we need to represent \( [\omega] \in H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D) \) by an explicit cocycle as in Lemma D.4. For this, let \( \gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_m \). With the principal part of \( \omega \) in \( Q_i \), such a function exists because the residue of \( \omega \) vanishes. Put \( \omega_i = \omega - df_i \). Let \( U_i \subset C \) be the complement of the set of poles of \( \omega_i \). By construction \( Q_i \subset U_i \). Put also \( U_0 = C^o \), \( \omega_0 = \omega \), \( f_0 = 0 \). Then \( H = \{ U_0, \ldots, U_m \} \) is an open cover of \( C \). The differential form \( \omega \) defines a cycle in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^o, D; \gamma_1 \cap C^o) \) given by the tuple \( \omega = (\omega|U_i, 0, 0) \). It is cohomologous to the cycle

\[
\omega - \partial f = (\omega - df_i, -f_j + f_i, f_i|D).
\]

It defines a cycle in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D; \gamma_1 \cap C^o) \) as required. We fix the additive constants of the \( f_i \) such that \( F = f_i|D \subset U_i \) is independent of the choice of \( i \). This is possible by the cocycle condition. The condition for non-trivial vanishing is

\[
(5) \quad [\omega]|M_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i(F(\gamma_i(1)) - F(\gamma_i(0))) = 0.
\]

Note that the function \( F \) is only unique up to a global additive constant, but this constant cancels in the above sum.

**Summary 8.6.** Let \( J(C) \) be simple. Assume that \( \omega \) is of the second kind, but neither of the first kind nor exact. Then there is non-trivial vanishing if and only if \( l(\sigma) = 0 \) and equation (5) holds for \( F \) as above.

8.4. Forms of the third kind

Assume that \( \omega \) has a non-empty set of poles, all of them simple. In the language of Hodge theory this makes it a differential form with log poles. The form \( \omega \) defines a class \( [\omega] \in H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^o, D) \). It is always non-zero. Hence the period integral vanishes trivially if \( [\sigma] = 0 \). Again we get non-trivial vanishing from the decompositions of \( J(C) \) and the kernel of \( L \to J(C^o) \). We have \( \omega \in H^0(C, \Omega^1(\log(S))) = F^1 H^1_{\text{dR}}(C^o, D) \), so the discussion of the
8.5. THE CASE OF A SINGLE PATH

The kernel is identical to the case of differentials of the first kind. We get non-trivial vanishing if \( l(\sigma) = 0 \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C^o))^\text{an} \).

Let us now assume that \( J(C) \) is simple and \( L \to J(C^o) \) is injective. Differentials of the third kind are not exact, so vanishing caused by submotives of the form \( M_1 = [L_1 \to J(C^o)] \) does not appear.

We still have to consider submotives of the form \( M_1 = [L_1 \to J(C^o)] \) where \( T_1 \) is a torus such that \( \sigma \) is in the image of \( V_{\text{sing}}([L_2 \to J(C)]) \). As in the case of differentials of the first kind this implies that the image of \( l(\sigma) \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C))^\text{an} \) vanishes. In other words, it is in \( \text{Lie}(T(S))^\text{an} \) where \( T(S) \) is the torus part of \( J(C^o) \). Hence there is a linear combination \( \varepsilon = \sum b_j \varepsilon_j \) of simple loops in \( C^o,\text{an} \) around the singularities \( Q_j \in S \) such that the image of \( l(\varepsilon) - l(\sigma) \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C^o,\text{an})) \) vanishes. Hence there is non-trivial vanishing for \( \varepsilon - \sigma \) by the case treated before. Non-trivial vanishing for \( \sigma \) is equivalent to non-trivial vanishing for \( \varepsilon \). Let \( n_\sigma(Q_i) \) be the winding number of \( \varepsilon \) around \( Q_i \in S \). The period integral is up to the factor \( 2\pi i \) a linear combination of the residues:

\[
\int_\sigma \omega = \sum_{i=1}^m 2\pi i n_\sigma(Q_i) \text{Res}_{Q_i}(\omega).
\]

This can vanish and it will.

**Example 8.7.** Choose a disc \( \Delta_i \) around each \( Q_i \) and let \( \gamma_i = \partial \Delta_i \). Then \( \int \gamma_i \omega = 0 \) by Cauchy’s Residue Theorem.

**Summary 8.8.** Let \( J(C) \) be simple, \( \omega \) a differential form of the third kind. Then there is non-trivial vanishing if and only if

1. \( l(\sigma) = 0 \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C^o))^\text{an} \); or
2. The image of \( l(\sigma) \) in \( \text{Lie}(J(C))^\text{an} \) vanishes and the linear combination in (6) vanishes.

8.5. The case of a single path

The discussion simplifies if \( \sigma = \gamma \) consists of a single path. Then we have \( L = \mathbb{Z} \). The condition \( l(\sigma) = 0 \) that came up in our discussion simply means that \( \gamma \) is closed and \( \tilde{\gamma} \) null-homotopic in \( J(C)^\text{an} \) or \( J(C^o)^\text{an} \), respectively. In most cases, this amounts to trivial vanishing with \( D = \emptyset \).

**Theorem 8.9.** Assume that \( J(C) \) is simple, \( J(C^o) \) non-split (even up to isogeny), \( \omega \) non-exact. Let \( \gamma \) be a path such that either

1. \( \gamma \) is closed with non-trivial homotopy class in \( J(C)^\text{an} \); or
2. \( \gamma \) is non-closed with end point in \( C^o(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \).

Then \( \int_\gamma \omega \) is transcendental.

**Proof.** Assume \( \int_\gamma \omega \) is algebraic. By Theorem 7.10 \( \omega = df + \phi \) with \( \int_\gamma \phi = 0 \).
We continue with the notation of the beginning of Chapter 8. As above, we consider \( M = [L \to J(C^o)] \) with \( L = \mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \). We start with the case of a closed path. Then \( L = 0 \). The vanishing implies the existence of a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0 \]

with the class of \( \gamma \) induced from \( V_{\text{sing}}(M_1) \) and the class of \( \phi \) induced from \( V_{\text{dir}}(M_2) \). We have \( M_1 = [0 \to G_1] \) for a subgroup \( G_1 \subset J(C^o) \). By assumption, the image of the class of \( \gamma \) is non-trivial on \( J(C) \) and \( J(C) \) is simple, hence the abelian part of \( G_1 \) is equal to \( J(C^o) \). Hence \( M_2 = [0 \to T_2] \) for a torus \( T_2 \). This gives a splitting of \( J(C^o) \). By assumption such a splitting does not exist, hence \( T_2 = 0 \) and \( G_1 = J(C^o) \). This implies \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \omega = df \), contradicting the assumption of the theorem.

We now turn to the case of a non-closed path. We have \( L = \mathbb{Z} \) with \( 1 \mapsto \gamma(1) - \gamma(0) \). The assumption \( \gamma(1) \neq \gamma(0) \) implies \( P(\gamma) \neq 0 \) in \( J(C) \). If \( P(\gamma) \) is \( n \)-torsion, we proceed as in the discussion of general \( \sigma \) and forms of the first kind in Section 8.1: we replace \( \gamma \) by \( [n] \gamma \). This is a closed path with non-trivial homotopy class in \( J(C) \). By the first case we deduce \( \phi = 0 \). Hence we may now assume that \( P(\gamma) \) is non-torsion. As before there is a short exact sequence

\[ 0 \to M_1 \to M \to M_2 \to 0 \]

with the class of \( \gamma \) induced from \( V_{\text{sing}}(M_1) \) and the class of \( \omega \) induced from \( V_{\text{dir}}(M_2) \). The image of \( \gamma \) in \( V_{\text{sing}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0]) \) is non-trivial, hence \( M_1 = [\mathbb{Z} \to G_1] \). The abelian part of \( G_1 \) is \( J(C) \) because \( J(C) \) is simple and \( \mathbb{Z} \to J(C) \) non-zero. Hence \( M_2 \cong [0 \to T_2] \) for a torus \( T_2 \). This contradicts the assumption on \( J(C^o) \). Hence \( M_2 = 0 \) and hence again \( \phi = 0 \). \( \square \)

Remark 8.10. The same argument applies for any \( \sigma \) with \( l(\sigma) \neq 0 \).

This theorem can be applied to \( C = E \) an elliptic curve. We will return to this case in Chapter 10.
Part 3

Dimensions of period spaces
CHAPTER 9

Dimension computations

In this chapter we establish a formula for the dimension of $\mathcal{P}(M)$ for any 1-motive $M$. We have already given a qualitative characterisation in Corollary 3.10. The aim is now deduce explicit numbers in terms of the constituents of $M$.

Throughout this chapter let $M = [L \to G]$ be in $1\text{-Mot}_\mathbb{Q}$ and let $0 \to T \to G \to A \to 0$ be its decomposition into torus and abelian part. In the arguments below we reserve the letter $B$ for simple abelian varieties and define $E(B) = \text{End}(B)_\mathbb{Q}$. This is a division algebra of dimension $e(B) = \dim_\mathbb{Q} E(B)$. Let

$$A \cong B_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times B_m^{n_m}$$

be the isotypical decomposition of $A$. As usual, we write $X(T)$ for the character lattice of $T$. If $X$ is a lattice, we denote $T(X)$ the corresponding torus. Recall that the datum of a semi-abelian variety $G$ is equivalent to the datum of a homomorphism $X(T) \to A^\vee(\mathcal{Q})_\mathbb{Q}$, see Section 1.1.

9.1. Main Theorem

To state our Main Theorem we need some notation.

**Definition 9.1.**

1. Put $\delta(M) = \dim_\mathbb{Q} \mathcal{P}(M)$.
2. We define the $L$-rank $\text{rk}_B(L, M)$ of $M$ in $B$ as the $E(B)$-dimension of the vector space

$$\text{Hom}(A, B) \cdot L := \sum p(L) \subset B(\mathcal{Q})_\mathbb{Q}$$

for $p \in \text{Hom}(A, B)_\mathbb{Q}$ where $p(L)$ denotes the image of $L$ under the composition of $L \to A(\mathcal{Q})$ and $p$.
3. The endomorphism algebra $E(B)$ acts on $B^\vee$ from the right as $(b^\vee, e) \mapsto e^\vee(b^\vee)$ where $e^\vee$ signifies the isogeny dual to $e$. The $T$-rank $\text{rk}_B(T, M)$ of $M$ in $B$ is the $E(B)$-dimension of the right-$E(B)$-vector space

$$\text{Hom}(A^\vee, B^\vee)_\mathbb{Q} \cdot X(T) := \sum p(X(T)) \subset B^\vee(\mathcal{Q})_\mathbb{Q}$$

for $p \in \text{Hom}(A^\vee, B^\vee)_\mathbb{Q}$ where $p(X(T))$ denotes the image of $X(T)$ under the composition of $X(T) \to A^\vee(\mathcal{Q})_\mathbb{Q}$ with $p$.
4. We define

$$\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \dim_\mathbb{Q} (L_Q \otimes X(T)_\mathbb{Q}/R_{\text{inc3}}(M))$$
with

\[ R_{\text{inc}3}(M) = \langle y \in \mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T)_{\mathbb{Q}} \mid \exists \alpha \in \text{End}(L^\vee \otimes A)_{\mathbb{Q}}, x \in (L \otimes A^\vee)(\mathcal{O})_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{ s.t. (A), (B) below} \rangle. \]

The definition of \( R_{\text{inc}3} \) is tedious and needs some explanation. If \( \Lambda \) is a free abelian group of finite rank and \( G \) a semi-abelian variety, we can define the semi-abelian variety \( \Lambda \otimes G \cong G^{\text{rk}\Lambda} \). We apply this to \( \Lambda = L^\vee \) and the semi-abelian varieties \( G \) and \( A \). The structure map \( \iota : L \to G \) of \( M \) induces a homomorphism \( \mathbb{Z} \to L^\vee \otimes G \) as follows: if \( l_1, \ldots, l_r \) is a basis of \( L \), then \( c := \sum_i l_i^\vee \otimes \iota(l_i) \) is the image of 1. This map is independent of the choice of a basis and has the properties of an adjoint of \( \iota \).

Put \( E = \text{End}(L^\vee \otimes A)_{\mathbb{Q}} \). It operates (up to isogeny) from the right on \( (L^\vee \otimes A)^\vee \cong L \otimes A^\vee \). On the other hand, the semi-abelian variety \( L^\vee \otimes G \) is characterised by a homomorphism \( [L^\vee \otimes G] : X(L^\vee \otimes T) \to (L^\vee \otimes A)^\vee(\mathcal{O})_{\mathbb{Q}} \).

Let \( \alpha \in E, y \in L \otimes X(T), x \in L \otimes A^\vee(\mathcal{O})_{\mathbb{Q}} \). They define \( G_x, G_{\alpha^\vee(x)} \cong \alpha^\ast G_x \) and \( G_{[L^\vee \otimes G](y)} \) in \( \text{Ext}^1(L^\vee \otimes A, \mathbb{G}_m) \). The compatibility conditions are:

(A) \( \alpha^\vee(x) = [L^\vee \otimes G](y) \); in other words we have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(L^\vee \otimes T) & \xrightarrow{y \mapsto 1} & \mathbb{Z} = X(\mathbb{G}_m) \\
[L^\vee \otimes G] & \downarrow & [G_x] \\
L \otimes A^\vee(\mathcal{O}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha^\vee} & L \otimes A^\vee(\mathcal{O})
\end{array}
\]

hence \( \alpha \) extends to a morphism

\( \alpha_y : L^\vee \otimes G \to G_x \).

(B) \( \alpha_y(c) = 0 \) in \( G_x \); hence \( \alpha_y \) defines a morphism

\( [\mathbb{Z} \to L^\vee \otimes G] \to [0 \to G_x] \).

For alternative descriptions of \( R_{\text{inc}3}(M) \) see Section 9.8. They are less arbitrary, but also less effective.

**Theorem 9.2 (Baker’s Theorem for 1-motives).** Let \( M \) be a 1-motive with constituents as above. Then:

\[
\delta(M) = \delta(T) + \sum_B \frac{4g(B)^2}{e(B)} + \delta(L) + \sum_B (2g(B)\text{rk}_B(T, M) + 2g(B)\text{rk}_B(L, M)) + \delta_{\text{inc}3}(M)
\]

where all sums are taken over all simple factors of \( A \), without multiplicities.

We have \( \delta(L) = 1 \) if \( L \neq 0 \) and \( \delta(L) = 0 \) if \( L = 0 \), and \( \delta(T) = 1 \) if \( T \neq 0 \) and \( \delta(T) = 0 \) if \( T = 0 \).
The proof will be given at the end of the chapter.

The contribution \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) \) is not easy to compute in practice. A more accessible formula is possible in special cases. In general we get at least an upper bound. This needs some more terminology.

**Definition 9.3.**
1. We say that \( M \) is of **Baker type** if \( A = 0 \).
2. We say that is of **semi-abelian type** if \( L = 0 \).
3. We say it is of **second kind** if \( T = 0 \).
4. We say that it is **reduced** if \( L \to A(\overline{Q})_Q \) and \( X(T) \to A'(\overline{Q})_Q \) are injective.
5. We say that it is **saturated** if it is reduced, and \( \text{End}(M)_Q = \text{End}(A)_Q \).

**Definition 9.4.** If \([L \to T]\) is a 1-motive of Baker type, we define the **L-rank** \( \text{rk}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(L, M) \) of \( M \) in \( \mathbb{G}_m \) as the rank of

\[
\text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m) \cdot L := \sum_{\chi \in X(T)} \chi(L)
\]

where \( \chi(L) \) denotes the image of \( L \) under the composition of \( L \to T \) and \( \chi \in X(T) \).

**Theorem 9.5 (Incomplete periods of the third kind).** The periods of the third kind satisfy:
1. If \( M \) is of Baker type, then \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \text{rk}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(L, M) \).
2. If \( M \) is of semi-abelian type or of the second kind, then \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = 0 \).
3. If \( M \) is saturated, then

\[
\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \sum_B e(B) \text{rk}_B(L, M) \text{rk}_B(T, M)
\]

where the sum is over all simple abelian varieties \( B \).
4. If \( M = M_0 \times M_1 \) with \( M_0 \) of Baker type, and \( M_1 \) saturated, then

\[
\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M_0) + \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M_1).
\]
5. For every 1-motive \( M \), there is \( \tilde{M} \) such that \( \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(\tilde{M}) \) and \( M \) is the product of a motive of Baker type and a saturated motive. The construction is effective (see Section 9.7) in a way that the abelian parts of \( M \) and \( \tilde{M} \) agree.

We are going to see in Remark 9.19 below that the inequality \( \delta(M) \leq \delta(\tilde{M}) \) is not an equality in general.

**9.2. An example**

Let \( M \) be as in Chapter 5: let \( A = E \) be an elliptic curve, \( 0 \to \mathbb{G}_m \to G \to E \to 0 \) a non-trivial extension (which is even non-split up to isogeny) and \( P \in G(\overline{Q}) \) a point whose image in \( E(\overline{Q}) \) is not torsion. We consider

\[
M = [Z \to G]
\]

with 1 mapping to \( P \).
Assume \( \text{End}(E) = \mathbb{Z} \). In terms of Theorem 9.2 or Proposition 9.10 this means \( m = 1, g = 1, e = e(E) = 1, \delta(T) = 1, \delta(L) = 1 \). Finally, \( \text{rk}_E(T, M) = 1 \) and \( \text{rk}_E(L, M) = 1 \). We also compute \( \delta_{\text{inc}}(M) \), see Definition 9.1 (4). If \( \alpha^*x \) is one of the generators of \( \text{R}_{\text{inc}}(M) \), then \( \alpha^*c = 0 \). There are no such \( \alpha \neq 0 \) because \( \text{End}(E)_{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{Q} \) and \( c \neq 0 \). Hence \( \text{R}_{\text{inc}}(M) = 0 \) and \( \delta_{\text{inc}}(M) = \dim \mathbb{Q} \otimes X(G_m)_{\mathbb{Q}} = 1 \).

\( \delta(M) = 9 \).

Indeed, this is Proposition 5.2.

9.3. Structure of the period space

We return to the general case. The inclusions

\[
[0 \to T] \subset [0 \to G] \subset [L \to G]
\]

induce

\[
V_{\text{sing}}(T) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(G) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(M).
\]

and dually

\[
V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L \to A]) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L \to 0]).
\]

Together, they introduce a bifiltration on \( \mathcal{P}(M) \):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\mathcal{P}(T) \searrow \mathcal{P}(G) \searrow \mathcal{P}(M) \\
\mathcal{P}(A) \searrow \mathcal{P}([L \to A]) \\
\mathcal{P}([L \to 0])
\end{array}
\]

We introduce the notation and terminology

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{P}_{\text{Ta}}(M) &= \mathcal{P}(T) & \text{Tate periods} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M) &= \mathcal{P}(A) & \text{2nd kind wrt closed paths} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M) &= \mathcal{P}([L \to 0]) & \text{algebr. periods} \\
\mathcal{P}_3(M) &= \mathcal{P}(G)/(\mathcal{P}_{\text{Ta}}(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M)) & \text{3rd kind wrt closed paths} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc2}}(M) &= \mathcal{P}([L \to A])/(\mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M)) & \text{2nd kind wrt non-cl. paths} \\
\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M) &= \mathcal{P}(M)/(\mathcal{P}_3(M) + \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc2}}(M)) & \text{3rd kind wrt non-cl. paths}
\end{align*}
\]

If \( M \) is of Baker type (i.e., \( A = 0 \)) we also use \( \mathcal{P}_{\text{Bk}}(M) = \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M) \).
Note that for example periods of the third kind with respect to closed paths are only well-defined up to periods of Tate type and periods of the second kind with respect to closed paths.

We are going to determine the dimensions of the various blocks one by one. By adding up we are going to get $\delta(M)$. This works because of the following property:

**Theorem 9.6.** The spaces $\mathcal{P}_{\text{Tate}}(M)$, $\mathcal{P}_{\text{alg}}(M)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\text{ab}}(M)$ have mutually trivial intersection. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{P}(G) \cap \mathcal{P}([L \to A]) = \mathcal{P}(A).$$

The proof will be given along the proof of the dimension formula at the end of the chapter.

**Definition 9.7.** We put $\delta_? = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{P}_?(M)$ for $? \in \text{Tate}, \text{alg}, \text{ab}, 3, \text{inc}_2, \text{inc}_3, \text{Bk}$.

We now have two definitions of $\delta_{\text{inc}_3}(M)$. We are going to show later that they agree.

**Remark 9.8.** All Tate periods are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-multiples of $2\pi i$. All algebraic periods are in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Baker periods are values of log in algebraic numbers.

### 9.4. The saturated case

The saturated case is easier and covers all entries except $\mathcal{P}_{\text{inc}_3}(M)$.

#### 9.4.1. Saturated and simple

Assume $M$ is reduced and saturated (see Definition 9.3) with $A = B$ simple of dimension $g$. Let $E = \text{End}(B)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ of $\mathbb{Q}$-dimension $e$. Then $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ is an $E$-module and we choose bases as such. The inclusions

$$[0 \to T] \subset [0 \to G] \to [L \to G]$$

induce

$$V_{\text{sing}}(T) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(G) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{sing}}(M).$$

Let $\sigma = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_r)$ be an $E$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(T)$. We abbreviate $r = |\sigma|$. We will use the same conventions for all other pieces. Extend $\sigma$ by $\gamma$ to an $E$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(G)$ and by $\lambda$ to an $E$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$.

Dually, we choose $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-bases (sic!) of $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$ along the inclusions

$$V_{\text{dR}}(L) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}([L \to B]) \hookrightarrow V_{\text{dR}}(M).$$

Let $u$ be a basis of $V_{\text{dR}}([L \to 0])$. We extend by $\omega$ to a basis of $V_{\text{dR}}([L \to A])$. We extend by $\xi$ to a basis of $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$. Note that $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$ is also a right $E$-module, but we are not using this structure at this point.

Our discussion shows that the full period matrix of $M$ has the shape

$$\begin{pmatrix}
\xi(\sigma) & \xi(\gamma) & \xi(\lambda) \\
\omega(\sigma) & \omega(\gamma) & \omega(\lambda) \\
u(\sigma) & u(\gamma) & u(\lambda)
\end{pmatrix} =
\begin{pmatrix}
\xi(\sigma) & \xi(\gamma) & \xi(\lambda) \\
0 & \omega(\gamma) & \omega(\lambda) \\
0 & 0 & u(\lambda)
\end{pmatrix}. $$

(7)
Lemma 9.9. The entries of the matrix above generate $\mathcal{P}(M)$. The elements of $\xi(\sigma)$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-multiples of $2\pi i$. The elements of $u(\lambda)$ are $\mathbb{Q}$-multiples of 1. These are the only $\mathbb{Q}$-linear relations between the entries.

Proof. Let $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_e$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $E$. Then the tuples $(\alpha_j\sigma, \alpha_j\gamma, \alpha_j\lambda|j = 1, \ldots, e)$ are a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$, hence the period space is generated by $\xi(\alpha_j\sigma), \ldots$. We have

$$\xi_j(\alpha_j\sigma, \sigma_k) = (\alpha_j^*\xi_j)(\sigma_k).$$

The class $\alpha_j^*\xi_j$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of the $\xi$'s:

$$\alpha_j^*\xi_i = \sum b_k \xi_s \Rightarrow \xi(\alpha_j\sigma, \sigma_k) = \sum b_k \xi_s(\sigma_k).$$

The same computation also applies to rest of the basis and we see that the period space has $\mathbb{Q}$-generators as claimed.

Now assume that there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear relation between the periods. It has the shape

$$\sum a \xi(\sigma) + \sum b \xi(\gamma) + \sum c \xi(\lambda) + \sum d \omega(\gamma) + \sum f \omega(\lambda) + \sum g u(\lambda) = 0.$$

Here $a$ is a matrix and we take the sum $\sum_{i,j} a_{ij}\xi_i(\sigma_j)$. The same convention is used in all other places.

We define $T_{\sigma} = \mathbb{Q}_{\sigma}^{[2]}$, $M_{\sigma} = [0 \rightarrow T_{\sigma}]$, $G_\gamma = G^{[\gamma]}$, $M_\gamma = [0 \rightarrow G_\gamma]$, $M_\lambda = M^{[\lambda]}$ and consider

$$\tilde{M} = M_{\sigma} \times M_\gamma \times M_\lambda,$$

with $\tilde{M} = [\tilde{L} \rightarrow \tilde{G}]$ and

$$0 \rightarrow \tilde{T} \rightarrow \tilde{G} \rightarrow \tilde{A} \rightarrow 0$$

with $\tilde{T}$ a torus and $\tilde{A}$ an abelian, and classes

$$\tilde{\gamma} = (\sigma, \gamma, \lambda) \in V_{\text{sing}}(\tilde{M}),$$

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\phi, \psi, \theta) \in V_{dR}^\vee(\tilde{M})$$

where

$$\phi = \left(\sum a_{ij}\xi_i|i = 1, \ldots, |\sigma|\right),$$

$$\psi = \left(\sum b_{ij}\xi_i + \sum d_{ij}\omega_j|i = 1, \ldots, |\gamma|\right),$$

$$\theta = \left(\sum c_{ij}\xi_i + \sum f_{ij}\omega_j + \sum g_{ij}u_j|i = 1, \ldots, |\lambda|\right).$$

Then $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{\gamma}) = 0$. By the subgroup theorem for 1-motives, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_1 \overset{\nu}{\rightarrow} \tilde{M} \overset{\tilde{p}}{\rightarrow} M_2 \rightarrow 0$$

with $M_1 = [L_1 \rightarrow G_1]$, $M_2 = [L_2 \rightarrow G_2]$ and $\tilde{\gamma} = \nu_\ast \gamma_1$, $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{p}^\ast \omega_2$.

We analyse $M_2$. Assume $A_2 \neq 0$. Then there is a non-zero homomorphism $A_2 \rightarrow B$. The composition $\tilde{A} = B^{[\gamma]} \times B^{[\lambda]} \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow B$ is given by a tuple $(n, m)$ of elements of $E$. We now determine the image $\tilde{L}_2$ of $L_2$ in $B$.

We have $\tilde{L}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{[\lambda]} m_i(L)$ because the lattice part of $M_\gamma$ is 0. The image is contained in $L$ because by saturatedness $L$ is $E$-stable. We have $\tilde{L}_2 \neq 0$ if there is some $m_i \neq 0$. In this case $\tilde{L}_2 = L$ because $m_i$ is a unit in a division
algebra and because \( L \to G \to B \) is injective. This is where we use that \( M \) is reduced. We compute the image of \( \tilde{\gamma} \) under \( \bar{p}: \tilde{M} \to M_2 \to [L \to B] \). It is equal to

\[
\sum n_j \gamma_j + \sum m_i \lambda_i \in V_{\text{sing}}([L \to B]).
\]

It vanishes because \( p_* \tilde{\gamma} = 0 \). The image of \( (\gamma, \lambda) \) is an \( E \)-basis of \( V_{\text{sing}}([L \to B]) \). Hence \( m_i = 0 \) for all \( i \) and \( n_j = 0 \) for all \( j \). This contradicts the non-triviality of \( \tilde{A} \to A_2 \to B \). Hence \( A_2 = 0 \).

Consider the composition of the inclusion of one of the factors \([0 \to G]\) of \( M_\gamma \) into \( \tilde{M} \) with \( p \). It has the shape

\[
[0 \to G] \to [L_2 \to T_2].
\]

If the group component of this map was non-trivial this would induce a splitting of \( G \). This is not possible because we have assumed that \( M \) is reduced. The map has to vanish. Hence the pull-back of \( \tilde{\omega} = p^* \omega_2 \to G \) is equal to

\[
\tilde{\omega}|_G = (p^* \omega_2)|_G = 0^* \omega_2 = 0.
\]

In other words, \( \psi = 0 \). By linear independence of the \( \xi_j \) and \( \omega_j \) this implies \( b = 0, \ d = 0 \).

We repeat the argument with the inclusion of one of the factors \( M \) of \( M_\lambda \) into \( \tilde{M} \). It has the shape

\[
[L \to G] \to [L_2 \to T_2]
\]

As \( M \) is reduced, the group component of this map vanishes. Let \( K_2 = \ker(L_2 \to T_2) \). The image of \( L \) in \( T_2 \) has to be 0 and therefore its image in \( L_2 \) is in \( K_2 \). This is true for all factors \( M \) of \( M_\lambda \), hence the surjection \( L^{[\lambda]} \to L_2 \) factors via \( K_2 \). This implies that \( L_2 = K_2 \) and the structure map \( L_2 \to T_2 \) of \( M_2 \) vanishes. The composition

\[
M_\lambda \to \tilde{M} \overset{p}{\to} M_2 \cong [L_2 \to 0] \times [0 \to T_2]
\]

has image in \([L_2 \to 0]\), hence the restriction of \( \tilde{\omega} = p^* \omega_2 \to V_{\text{dr}}^\vee(M_\lambda) \) takes values in \( V_{\text{dr}}^\vee(L^{[\lambda]}) \). By linear independece this implies \( c = 0, \ f = 0 \).

Our linear relation has been reduced to

\[
\sum a \xi(\sigma) + \sum g(\lambda) = 0.
\]

The terms on the left are periods of Tate type, hence multiples of \( 2\pi i \). The terms on the right are periods of algebraic type, hence multiples of 1. This reduces the proof to the transcendence of \( \pi \). This was shown in course of the proof of Proposition 5.1.

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 9.10.** Let \( M \) be saturated with \( A = B \) simple. Then

\[
\delta(M) = \delta_{\text{Tat}}(M) + \frac{4g^2}{e} + \delta_{\text{alg}}(M)
\]

\[ + 2g \text{rk}_B(G, M) + 2g \text{rk}_B(L, M) + e \text{rk}_B(G, M) \text{rk}_B(L, M). \]
We read off the numbers from the basis constructed in the last proof: We have

\[ |\sigma| = \text{rk}_B(G, M), |\gamma| = 2g/e, |\lambda| = \text{rk}_B(L, M), \]
\[ |\xi| = e \text{rk}_B(G, M), |\omega| = 2g, |\mu| = e \text{rk}_B(L, M). \]

\[ \square \]

### 9.4.2. Motives of Baker type.

**Proposition 9.11 (Baker’s theorem).** Let \( M = [L \to T] \) be of Baker type. Then

\[ \delta(M) = \delta_{\text{Ta}}(M) + \delta_{\text{alg}}(M) + \text{rk}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(L, M). \]

**Proof.** Consider \( [L \to T] = [K \to 0] \oplus [\tilde{L} \to T] \) with \( \tilde{L} \to T \) injective. The periods of \([L \to T]\) agree with the periods of \( M' = [\sum \chi(L)/\text{Torsion} \to \mathbb{G}_m] \) with \( \chi \) running through \( \text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m) \) as in the definition of \( \text{rk}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(L, M) \). The structure map of \( M' \) is injective. The torus part has rank \( \text{rk}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(L, T) \). We now choose bases and repeat the argument of the proof of Lemma 9.9 and Corollary 9.10 only simpler.

**Remark 9.12.** This is precisely Baker’s theorem, see [Bak67], see also [BW07, Theorem 2.3].

### 9.5. General saturated motives

Assume \( M \) is saturated, but \( A \) not necessarily simple. We have (up to isogeny)

\[ A \cong B_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times B_m^{n_m} \]

with simple, non-isogenous \( B_i \). Hence

\[ \text{End}(A) \cong M_{n_1}(E_1) \times \cdots \times M_{n_m}(E_m) \]

with non-isomorphic division algebras \( E_i \).

**Lemma 9.13.** There is a natural decomposition

\[ M \cong M_1^{n_1} \times \cdots \times M_m^{n_m} \]

with each \( M_i \) saturated with abelian part given by \( B_i \).

**Proof.** Let \( p_i \in \text{End}(A) \) be given as \((0, \ldots, 1_{M_{n_i}(E_i)}, 0, \ldots, 0)\) with \( 1_{M_{n_i}(E_i)} \) in position \( i \). This is the projection \( A \to B_i^{n_i} \subset A \). We have \( 1 = \sum p_i \). By saturatedness \( \text{End}(A) \cong \text{End}(M) \), hence we may also view \( p_i \) as projector on \( M \). We now replace \( M \) by \( p_i(M) \) and drop the index \( i \). The abelian part is equal to \( B_i^{n_i} \). Let \( q_1, \ldots, q_n \in M(E) \) be the projections to the components. As \( \text{End}(M) = M(E) \) this induces a decomposition

\[ M \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n q_i(M). \]
The permutation matrices in \( M_n(E) \) induce isomorphisms between the various \( q_i(M) \), hence we even have

\[
M \cong (M')^n
\]

with abelian part of \( M' \) given by \( B \).

**Proposition 9.14.** Consider a 1-motive of the form

\[
M_0 \times M
\]

with \( M_0 \) of Baker type and \( M \) saturated. Then the formula in Theorem 9.2 holds with \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) \) replaced by

\[
\text{rk}_{G_m}(L_0, M_0) + \sum_B e(B)\text{rk}_B(L, M)\text{rk}_B(T, M).
\]

**Proof.** By the Lemma we are dealing with the motive

\[
M_0 \times M_1 \times \cdots \times M_m
\]

with \( M_i \) as there. We have

\[
P(M_i^n) = P(M_i)
\]

hence we may without loss of generality assume \( n_i = 1 \) for \( i \geq 1 \). We now repeat the proof of Lemma 9.9 and Corollary 9.10 with an additional index \( i \), allowing also \( i = 0 \).

### 9.6. Reduction arguments

Our next step is to reduce the general case to the saturated one. This gives the full answer for all contributions except \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) \) (where it gives an estimate).

**9.6.1. Saturation.** Let \( M \) be reduced. We want to construct a saturated motive \( M_{\text{sat}} \) such that \( P(M) \subseteq P(M_{\text{sat}}) \). We abbreviate \( E = \text{End}(A) \mathbb{Q} \).

We start with the semi-abelian case. Let \( X = X(T) \subset A^\vee(\mathbb{Q}) \mathbb{Q} \) the embedding of the character lattice into \( \text{Ext}^1(A, T) \). The map is injective because we have assumed that \( M \) is reduced. Put \( X_{\text{sat}} = X \cap A^\vee(\mathbb{Q}) \mathbb{Q} \) and \( G_{\text{sat}} \) the semi-abelian variety defined by \( X_{\text{sat}} \subset A^\vee(\mathbb{Q}) \mathbb{Q} \). The inclusion \( X \subset XE \) corresponds to a projection \( G_{\text{sat}} \rightarrow G \). By construction \( \text{End}(G_{\text{sat}}) = E \).

We do the same with \( M = [L \rightarrow A] \). This gives \( M_{\text{sat}} = [EL \rightarrow A] \) and an inclusion \( M \hookrightarrow M_{\text{sat}} \) such that \( \text{End}(M_{\text{sat}}) \mathbb{Q} = E \).

**Lemma 9.15.** Let \( G \) be semi-abelian and reduced viewed as 1-motive. Then

\[
P(G) = P(G_{\text{sat}}).
\]

If \( [L \rightarrow A] \) be of abelian type and reduced then

\[
P([L \rightarrow A]) = P([L_{\text{sat}} \rightarrow A]).
\]
9. DIMENSION COMPUTATIONS

**Proof.** We begin with the case $M = [L \to A]$. We have an inclusion $M \to M_{\text{sat}}$, hence $\mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(M_{\text{sat}})$.

We now establish the converse inclusion. As before let $E = \text{End}(A)$. Let $e$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $E$. Let $\gamma$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(A)$. Extend by $l$ to a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$. We abbreviate $e_i l$ for the set $e_i l_j$ for $e_i \in e$, $l_j \in l$. Then $(\gamma, e_i l)$ generate $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$. Let $u$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L \to 0])$. We abbreviate $e^* u$ for the set $e^*_i u_j$ for $e_i \in e$, $u_j \in u$. Then $e^* u$ generates $V_{\text{dR}}^\vee([L_{\text{sat}} \to 0])$. Extend by $\omega$ to a system of generators of $V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M)$. All periods of the form $e^* u(e_i l)$ are algebraic, hence contained in $u(l)$. Consider a period

$$\omega_k(e_i l_j) = e_i^* \omega_k(l_j).$$

The element $e_i^* \omega_k \in V_{\text{dR}}^\vee(M_{\text{sat}})$ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear combination of the generators $(e^* u, \omega)$, hence the period $e_i^* \omega_k(l_j)$ is a linear combination of periods of the form $e^*_i u_n(l_j)$ and $\omega_k(l_j)$, both contained in $\mathcal{P}(M)$.

The argument in the case $M = [0 \to G]$ follows the same pattern with the filtration $T \subset G$. $\square$

**First part of the proof of Theorems 9.2, 9.5 and 9.6.** Let $M = [0 \to G]$ be semi-abelian. As in Remark 1.1 it is of the form $G \cong T' \times G'$ with $G'$ reduced. We always have $\mathcal{P}(G') \subset \mathcal{P}(G) = \mathcal{P}(G') + \mathcal{P}(T')$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}(T') \subset \mathcal{P}(G')$ unless $G'$ has no torus part, i.e., $G' = A$ abelian. In the exceptional case, the dimension computation is a degenerate case of Proposition 9.14.

If we are not in this special case, we may replace $G$ by $G'$ and assume that $G$ is reduced. Lemma 9.15 together with the dimension formula in the semi-abelian saturated case in Proposition 9.14 leads to a dimension computation for $\delta(G)$. It is the one claimed in Theorem 9.2 with $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(G) = 0$, as asserted in Theorem 9.5.

The same arguments also applies to $M$ of abelian type, i.e., with $T = 0$.

Now consider general $M$. We apply our computations to

$$\mathcal{P}(G) + \mathcal{P}([L \to A]) = \mathcal{P}(G_{\text{sat}}) + \mathcal{P}([L \to A]_{\text{sat}}) = \mathcal{P}(G_{\text{sat}} \times [L \to A]_{\text{sat}}).$$

Comparing with dimensions for $T \times A \times [L \to A]$, $G$ and $[L \to A]$, we have shown Theorem 9.6 and computed $\delta_\gamma(M)$ for all $\neq \text{inc3}$.

In the special cases of $M$’s of Baker, semi-abelian, of the second kind, saturated or a product of a motive of Baker type and a saturated one, we have verified the formula for $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ given in Theorem 9.5. $\square$

It remains to verify the estimate for $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ in Theorem 9.5 and the precise formula for $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ of Definition 9.1.

### 9.7. An estimate for $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$

Let $M$ be a 1-motive. We construct canonically a 1-motive $M_{\text{Bk}}$ of Baker type and non-canonically a reduced $M_{\text{red}}$ such that

$$\mathcal{P}(M) = \mathcal{P}(M_{\text{red}}) + \mathcal{P}(M_{\text{Bk}}).$$
9.7. AN ESTIMATE FOR $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$

We proceed as follows: The composition $L \to G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_{\mathbb{Q}} \to A(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_{\mathbb{Q}}$ has a kernel $L'$ and an image $L''$. As $L' \to G$ factors via $T$, this defines a motive $[L' \to T]$. Similarly $X(T) \to A(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ has a kernel $X(T'') \subset X(T)$ (for some quotient $T \to T''$) and an image $X(T')$ (for some subtorus $T' \subset T$). As in Remark 1.1 it induces a canonical short exact sequence

$$0 \to G' \to G \to T'' \to 0$$

of semi-abelian groups.

With these data we define a Baker type motive

$$M_{\text{Bk}} = [L' \to T] \oplus [L \to T'']$$

We now choose splittings $L \cong L' \times L''$ and $X(T) \cong X(T') \times X(T'')$ inducing $G \cong G' \times T''$, see Remark 1.1. The composition of $L'' \to G$ with the projection $G \to G'$ defines (uncanonically) a reduced motive

$$M_{\text{red}} = [L'' \to G'].$$ 

Note the the $L$-rank and the $T$-rank of $M$ only depend on $M_{\text{red}}$.

REMARK 9.16. If a semi-simple algebra $E$ operates on $M$, then it will automatically act on $M_{\text{Bk}}$. Moreover, $M_{\text{red}}$ can be constructed such that $E$ still operates. We only have to choose the splittings of $L$ and $X(T)$ equivariantly.

LEMMA 9.17. We have

$$\mathcal{P}(M) = \mathcal{P}(M_{\text{Bk}}) + \mathcal{P}(M_{\text{red}}).$$

PROOF. Both summands are subquotients of $M$, hence their periods are contained in the left hand side. It remains to check the opposite inclusion.

Recall from Remark 1.1 that we have $G \cong G' \times T''$ with $G'$ reduced as a 1-motive. By composition, the map $L \to G$ induces $L \to G'$ and $L \to T''$. The morphism

$$[L \to G] \to [L \to G'] \times [L \to T'']$$

is injective, hence

$$\mathcal{P}(M) \subseteq \mathcal{P}([L \to G']) + \mathcal{P}([L \to T'']).$$

In the second step, recall that by definition $L \cong L' \times L''$ with $L' \to A$ injective and $L'' \to G$ factoring via $T$. The map

$$[L' \to G'] \times [L'' \to G'] \to [L \to G']$$

is surjective, hence

$$\mathcal{P}([L \to G']) \subseteq \mathcal{P}([L' \to G']) + \mathcal{P}([L'' \to G']).$$

This is close to the shape that we need, but not quite the same. We need to work on the first summand. By assumption $L' \to G'$ factors via $T'$. Hence we get a well-defined morphism

$$[L' \to T'] \times [0 \to G'] \to [L' \to G']$$
which is surjective. Hence
\[ \mathcal{P}(\{L' \to G'\}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\{L' \to T'\}) + \mathcal{P}(G'). \]
Putting these together we get
\[ \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(\{L' \to T\}) + \mathcal{P}(\{L'' \to G'\}) + \mathcal{P}(\{L \to T''\}). \]
By definition the first and the last summand add up to \( \mathcal{P}(M_{Bk}) \) whereas the middle summand equals \( \mathcal{P}(M_{red}) \).

Let \( M \) be reduced. We abbreviate \( E = \text{End}(A)_\mathbb{Q} \). We want to construct a motive \( M_{sat} = M_0 \times M_1 \) such that \( \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(M_{sat}) \), \( M_0 \) is of Baker type and \( M_1 \) saturated with \( \text{End}(M_1) = E \). At the beginning of Section 9.6.1 we have already defined \( T_{sat}, G_{sat}, L_{sat} \) and \( L_{sat} \to A \) such that the \( E \)-operation extends.

It remains to lift \( L_{sat} \to A \) to a map \( L_{sat} \to G_{sat} \). We do not know how to do this canonically. We choose a lift of \( L \to G \) to a morphism \( L \to G_{sat} \). Consider \( L' := EL \subset G_{sat}(\mathbb{Q}) \). Its image in \( A(\mathbb{Q}) \) agrees with \( L_{sat} \). We put
\[ M' = [L' \to G_{sat}]. \]
By construction \( E \) operates on \( M' \). However, we do not know if \( L' \to L_{sat} \) is injective, i.e., in general \( M' \) is not reduced, hence not saturated. We put
\[ M_0 = M'_{Bk}, \quad M_1 = M'_{red}, \quad M_{sat} = M_0 \times M_1. \]
As pointed out in Remark 9.16 we can choose \( M'_{red} \) such that \( E \) still operates. This makes \( M_1 \) saturated.

**Lemma 9.18.** Let \( M \) be reduced, \( M_{sat} = M_0 \times M_1 \) as constructed above. Then \( M_0 \) is of Baker type, \( M_1 \) is saturated and
\[ \mathcal{P}(M_{sat}) \supset \mathcal{P}(M). \]

**Proof.** By definition, \( M_0 \) is of Baker type and \( M_1 \) reduced with \( E = \text{End}(A)_\mathbb{Q} \subset \text{End}(M_1) \subset \text{End}(A)_\mathbb{Q} \), hence \( M_1 \) is saturated.

By construction there is an injection \( [L \to G_{sat}] \to M' \) (with \( M' \) as in the construction of \( M_{sat} \)) and a surjection \( [L \to G_{sat}] \to M \). Together this gives the inclusion of periods
\[ \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(M'). \]
By Lemma 9.17 we also have
\[ \mathcal{P}(M') \subset \mathcal{P}(M'_{Bk} \times M'_{red}) = \mathcal{P}(M_{sat}). \]

**Proof of Theorem 9.5 (5).** By the lemmas we have
\[ \mathcal{P}(M) \subset \mathcal{P}(M_{Bk} \times M_0 \times M_1) \]
with \( M_{Bk} \) and \( M_0 \) of Baker type and \( M_1 \) saturated with the same abelian part as \( M \).
Example 9.19. Recall the case of a CM elliptic curve and a reduced motive with \( \text{rk}(L) = 1, \text{rk}(T) = 1 \), see Section 5.3. We had \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = 1 \). We compare this to \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M_{\text{BK}} \times M_0 \times M_1) \) as constructed in this section. We have \( M_{\text{BK}} = 0 \) because \( M \) is reduced. We have \( L_{\text{sat}} = E L \subset E\overline{(\mathbb{Q})} \), \( X(T_{\text{sat}}) = X(T)E \), both of \( \mathbb{Z} \)-rank 2. By construction \( G_{\text{sat}} \to G \) is a surjection. The construction asks for the choice of a lift of \( L \to G \) to \( L \to G_{\text{sat}} \). We then put \( L' = E L \subset G_{\text{sat}}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}) \). Then \( L' \) is an \( E \)-vector space of dimension 1 with non-trivial image in \( A(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_{\mathbb{Q}} \), hence \( L' \to A \) is injective. In this case, the motive \( M' = M_1 \) is already reduced and hence saturated. We have
\[
\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M_1) = e \text{rk}_{L_{\text{sat}}}(M_1) \text{rk}_{T_{\text{sat}}}(M_1) = 2.
\]
The space of periods of the saturation is strictly bigger than the space of periods of \( M \).

9.8. Precise computation for \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) \)

We are now studying the most complex part of the picture,
\[
P_{\text{inc3}}(M) = P(M)/(P(G) + P([L \to A])).
\]
We want to show that its dimension is given by \( \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) \) as in Definition 9.1.

The assignment \( M \mapsto P_{\text{inc3}}(M) \) only has a weak functoriality. If \( M' \to M \) is injective or \( M \to M'' \) surjective, the inclusions \( P(M'), P(M'') \subset P(M) \) also induce maps
\[
P_{\text{inc3}}(M') \to P_{\text{inc3}}(M), \quad P_{\text{inc3}}(M'') \to P_{\text{inc3}}(M).
\]
Recall the structure of the period space as discussed in Section 9.3. Note that Theorem 9.6 has meanwhile been established. We are now interested in the periods of the associated graded of top degree \( V_{\text{sing}}(M)/V_{\text{sing}}([0 \to G]) \cong V_{\text{sing}}([L \to 0]) \) and \( V_{\text{dR}}(M)/V_{\text{dR}}([L \to A]) \cong V_{\text{dR}}(T) \). We identify
\[
V_{\text{dR}}(T) = X(T) \otimes V_{\text{dR}}(\mathbb{G}_m) \cong X(T)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}},
\]
\[
V_{\text{sing}}([L \to 0]) = L \otimes V_{\text{sing}}([\mathbb{Z} \to 0]) \cong L_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}.
\]
We define a \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linear map
\[
\phi : L_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \otimes X(T)_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \to P_{\text{inc3}}(M)
\]
by mapping an elementary tensor \( l \otimes x \) to the period \( \xi(\lambda) \) where \( \xi \in V_{\text{dR}}(M) \) has image \( x \) in \( V_{\text{dR}}(T) \) and \( \lambda \in V_{\text{sing}}(M) \) has image \( l \) in \( V_{\text{sing}}([L \to 0]) \). Note that the class of \( \xi(\lambda) \) is independent of choices. The map \( \phi \) is compatible with the weak functoriality of \( P_{\text{inc3}} \). For \( M' \to M \) we have a commutative
and analogously for $M \rightarrow M''$.

We now want to describe the subspace of relations. By Theorem 3.8 all relations are induced from subquotients of $M^n$ for $n \geq 1$. Hence we start with obvious relations in $M^n = [L^n \rightarrow G^n]$ for $n \geq 1$. We are going to see that they suffice. Recall that a morphism of iso-1-motives $\alpha : M_1 \rightarrow M^n$ induces $\alpha_* : A_1 \rightarrow A^n$, $\alpha : L_1,Q \rightarrow L^n$ and $\alpha : T_1 \rightarrow T^n$. Dually we also have $\alpha^* : X(T^n)_Q \rightarrow X(T_1)_Q$. Consider an exact sequence

$$M_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} M^n \xrightarrow{\beta} M_2,$$

and put $\bar{M}_1$ the image of $M_1$ with inclusion $\bar{\alpha}$ into $M^n$. For $l_1 \in L_1$, $x_2 \in X(T_2)$ the period class $\phi_{M^n}(\alpha_*(l_1) \otimes \beta^*(x_2))$ agrees by the above relation with the image of

$$\phi_{\bar{M}_1}(\bar{l}_1 \otimes \bar{\alpha}^* \beta^* x_2) = \phi_{\bar{M}_1}(\bar{l}_1 \otimes 0) = 0 \in \mathcal{P}_{inc3}(\bar{M}_1),$$

hence the elements of $\alpha_*(L_1)_Q \otimes \beta^*(X(T_2))_Q$ have image 0 in in $\mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M^n)$.

This leads us to define for $n \geq 1$

$$R_n(M) \subset L^n_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T^n)_\mathbb{Q}$$

as the set

$$R_n(M) = \{\alpha_*(L_1)_\mathbb{Q} \otimes \beta^*(X(T_2))_\mathbb{Q} | M_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} M^n \xrightarrow{\beta} M_2 \text{ exact}\}$$

and

$$\bar{R}_n \subset L_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T)_\mathbb{Q}$$

as its image under the summation map $\sum p_i \otimes q_i : L^n_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T^n)_\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow L_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T)_\mathbb{Q}$. Here $p_i$ and $q_i$ are the projections to the $i$-th components, respectively. Note that they are pairwise orthogonal under $\phi$. The space $\bar{R}_n(M)$ is unchanged if we ask $\alpha$ to be injective and $\beta$ surjective. Alternatively, we have

$$\bar{R}_n(M) = \{\ker(\alpha^* : X(T^n)_\mathbb{Q} \rightarrow X(T_1)_\mathbb{Q}) | M_1 \xrightarrow{\alpha} M^n \}$$

We have trivial inclusions $\bar{R}_n(M) \subset \bar{R}_{n+1}(M)$. As $L_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T)_\mathbb{Q}$ is finite dimensional, the system $\bar{R}_n(M)$ has to stabilize. Actually, the proof below will show that taking $\text{rk}(L)$ or $\text{rk}(X(T))$ for $n$ suffices. Recall also the subset $R_{inc3}(M) \subset L_\mathbb{Q} \otimes X(T)_\mathbb{Q}$ appearing in Definition 9.1.
9.8. Precise Computation for $\delta_{\text{inc}}(M)$

We have now everything together to give a precise description of the space of incomplete period integrals of the third kind $P_{\text{inc}}(M)$ by generators and relations.

**Theorem 9.20.** We have $R_{\text{inc}}(M) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} R_n(M)$ and the period pairing $\phi$ induces an isomorphism

$$((L_Q \otimes X(T)_Q)/R_{\text{inc}}(M))_Q \to P_{\text{inc}}(M).$$

**Proof.** The extension of scalars $\phi \otimes \overline{Q}$ is clearly surjective. The elements of $R_n(M)$ are in the kernel of $\phi M^n : L^n_Q \otimes X(T^n)_Q \to P_{\text{inc}}(M^n)$. Hence the elements of $R_n(M)$ are in the kernel of $\phi_M$.

We now consider $R_{\text{inc}}(M)$. Let $l_1, \ldots, l_r$ be a basis of $L$. We use it to identify $L \otimes X(T) \cong X(T)'$ and with the dual bases $L^\vee \otimes T \cong T^\vee$, $L^\vee \otimes G \cong G^\vee$ and $L^\vee \otimes A \cong A^\vee$. In this identification, $R_{\text{inc}}(M)$ is by definition generated by elements $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_r) \in X(T)'$ satisfying $[L^\vee \otimes G]^\vee(y) = \alpha^*(x)$ for some $x \in A^\vee(\overline{Q})^r$ and $\alpha \in \text{End}(A^\vee)$ such that the image of $l = (l_1, \ldots, l_r)$ in $G_x$ vanishes. Hence by construction $R_{\text{inc}}(M) \in R_{\text{ker}}(M)$. In order to show the theorem, it suffices to show injectivity of

$$(L_Q \otimes X(T)_Q)/R_{\text{inc}}(M))_Q \to P_{\text{inc}}(M).$$

We now choose bases along the same pattern and with the same notation as before Lemma 9.9 but without taking the $\text{End}(A)$-action into account. Hence $(\sigma, \gamma, \lambda)$ is a $\overline{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ and $(u, \omega, \xi)$ is a $\overline{Q}$-basis of $V_{\text{dr}}(M)$. In the case of $\lambda$, we choose it such that its image in $V_{\text{sing}}([L \to 0])$ is equal to the basis $l$. In the case of $\xi$, we choose it such that its image in $V_{\text{dr}}(T)$ is a $\overline{Q}$-basis of $X(T)$. 

Suppose we have an element $\Psi$ in the kernel of equation (9). It is of the form $\Psi = \sum c_{ij} \lambda_i \otimes \xi_j$ such that its period is in $P([L \to A]) + P(G)$. This means that we have a $\overline{Q}$-linear relation

$$\sum a_\sigma \xi(\sigma) + \sum b_\gamma \xi(\gamma) + \sum c_\lambda \xi(\lambda) + \sum d_\omega \omega(\gamma) + \sum f_\omega \omega(\lambda) + \sum g_\mu(\lambda) = 0.$$

We consider $T_\sigma = \mathfrak{g}_m^{|v|}, \ M_\sigma = [0 \to T_\sigma], \ G_\gamma = G^{|\gamma|}, \ M_\gamma = [0 \to G_\gamma], \ G_\lambda = G^{[\lambda]} = G^r, \ M_\lambda = [\mathbb{Z} \to G_\lambda]$ mapping 1 to the image of $l$, and put

$$\tilde{M} = M_\sigma \times M_\gamma \times M_\lambda$$

and

$$\tilde{\gamma} = (\sigma, \gamma, \lambda) \in V_{\text{sing}}(\tilde{M}),$$

$$\tilde{\omega} = (\sum a_{ij} \xi_j | i = 1, \ldots, |\sigma|) \times (\sum b_{ij} \xi_j + \sum d_{ij} \omega_j | i = 1, \ldots, |\gamma|) \times \iota^*(\sum c_{ij} \xi_j + \sum f_{ij} \omega_j + \sum g_{ij} u_j | i = 1, \ldots, |\lambda|).$$

Here $\lambda$ stands for the element of $V_{\text{sing}}(M_\lambda) \subset V_{\text{sing}}(M)^r$ given by the vector $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_r)$ and $\iota : M_\lambda \to M^r$ is the inclusion.
Then $\tilde{\omega}(\tilde{\gamma}) = 0$. By the subgroup theorem for 1-motives, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \to M_1 \overset{\nu}{\to} \tilde{M} \overset{p}{\to} M_2 \to 0$$

with $\tilde{\gamma} = \nu \cdot \gamma_1$ and $\tilde{\omega} = p^* \omega_2$.

The push-forward of $\tilde{\gamma}$ to $V_{\text{sing}}([L_2 \to G_2])$ vanishes. Its image in $V_{\text{sing}}([L_2 \to 0]) \simeq L_2, \tilde{\omega}$ is the image of the generator of $\tilde{L} \simeq \mathbb{Z}$. It vanishes and hence $L_2 = 0$, $M_2 = [0 \to G_2]$.

Let $G'_2$ be the image of $G_\lambda \subset G \to G_2$. Its abelian part $A'_2$ agrees with the image of $A_\lambda \subset \tilde{A} \overset{p}{\to} A'_2 \to A_2$. The restriction of $\tilde{\omega}$ to $M_\lambda$ only depends on $p' : M_\lambda \to [0 \to G'_2]$, i.e., $\tilde{\omega} |_{M_\lambda} = p'^* \omega'_2$ for $\omega'_2 \in V_{\text{dR}}^*(G'_2)$. A further restriction gives $\tilde{\omega} |_{G_\lambda} = p'^* \omega'_2 \in V_{\text{dR}}^*(G_\lambda)$.

We now turn to the construction of $\alpha : A^r \to A^r$ as in the definition of $R_{\text{inc3}}(M)$. By semi-simplicity, we can embed $A'_2$ as a direct factor into $A_\lambda$, identifying $A_\lambda \simeq A'_2 \times A''_2$. Let

$$\alpha : A_\lambda \to A'_2 \to A_\lambda$$

be the corresponding projector. Dually, we have

$$X(T_\lambda) \overset{[G_\lambda]}{\longrightarrow} X(T'_2) \overset{[G'_2]}{\longrightarrow} X(T_\alpha)$$

choosing $X(T_\alpha)$ as $X(T'_2) \times 0$ over $A'_2 \times A''_2 \simeq A_\lambda$. This yields a semi-abelian variety $G'_\alpha$ over $A_\lambda = A^r$ and a lift

$$\tilde{\alpha} : G_\lambda \to G'_2 \to G_\alpha$$

of $\alpha$. We consider $X(T_\alpha) \to A^r(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})^r$. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_s$ be a basis of $X(T_\alpha)$. Let us sum up the situation: there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X(T)^r & \overset{\tilde{\alpha}^*}{\longrightarrow} & X(T_\alpha) \\
\downarrow{[G^r]} & & \downarrow{[G_\alpha]} \\
A^r(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})^r & \overset{\alpha^*}{\longrightarrow} & A^r(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})^r
\end{array}$$

and the image of $l \in G^r(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ in $G_\alpha$ and hence also in $G_{x_k}$ vanishes. For $k = 1, \ldots, s$, the triple $(\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}^* (x_k), x_k)$ satisfies the conditions of Definition 9.1 and by definition $\tilde{\alpha}^* (x_k) \in R_{\text{inc3}}(M) \subset X(T)^r$.

The element

$$\tilde{\omega} |_{G_\lambda} = \left( \sum c_{ij} \xi_j + \sum f_{ij} \omega_j \big| i = 1, \ldots, r \right) \in V_{\text{dR}}^*(M_\lambda)$$

is of the form $\alpha^* \omega_\alpha$ for some $\omega_\alpha \in V_{\text{dR}}^*(G_\alpha)$. We restrict further to $T_\lambda = T^r$ and have

$$\tilde{\omega} |_{T_\lambda} = \left( \sum c_{ij} \xi_j | i = 1, \ldots, r \right) = \alpha^*_T(\omega_\alpha |_{T_\alpha}) \in V_{\text{dR}}^*(T_\lambda) = X(T)^r_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}.$$
We have $\omega_\alpha|_{T_\alpha} = \sum_{k=1}^s h_k x_k$ with $h_k \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$. Hence

$$\Psi = \left( \sum_j c_{ij} \xi_j \right)_{i=1, \ldots, r} = \sum_{k=1}^s h_k \tilde{a}^*(x_k) \in R_{\text{inc3}}(M) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \overline{\mathbb{Q}}.$$ 

This proves our claim. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 9.21.**

$$\dim \mathcal{P}_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \delta_{\text{inc3}}(M).$$

**Proof.** Compare Definition 9.1 with the theorem. \hfill \Box

This also concludes the proof of Theorem 9.2.

**Remark 9.22.**

1. Let $l_1, \ldots, l_r$ be a basis of $L$. By means of this basis we identify

$$L \otimes X(T) \cong X(T) \otimes \mathbb{Q}, \quad L' \otimes G \cong G' \otimes \mathbb{Q}.$$ 

Recall $c = (l_1, \ldots, l_r) \in L'$. The process of Definition 9.1 can be understood as replacing $M = [L \to G]$ by $M' = [Z \to G']$ mapping 1 to the image of $c$. This does not change the periods. This point of view was used in the above proof.

2. If $M$ is of Baker type, i.e., $A = 0$, then $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ agrees with $\text{rk}_{gm}(L, M)$ of Definition 9.4.

3. We had the suspicion that there might be a better description of $R_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ in the language of biextensions. We now tend to think that this is not the case. The period pairing is not related to the pairing between a 1-motive and its Cartier-dual.

4. Note that we have shown that every $M$ is subquotient of a motive with the same abelian part but which is a product of a motive of Baker type and a saturated motive. The upper bound for $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ is an equality for this bigger motive. All other $\delta_r(M)$ remain unchanged.
CHAPTER 10

Elliptic curves

In some sense Baker’s theory of linear forms in logarithms can be seen as an intermezzo, although one of the most influential, in establishing a modern theory of periods. We shall now describe a second very important aspect, namely elliptic periods, of the theory which has been developed in the last one hundred years by many authors starting with Siegel and Schneider. We shall describe it first in a classical way as has been seen by these authors and give then the translation into our modern language of 1-motives. For more details about the history see the introduction, in particular Section 0.3.

10.1. Classical theory of periods

Our results about 1-motives related to elliptic curves can be formulated in a classical way which we shall explain in this section. For details see [Ahl53, Chapter 7] or [Cha85, Chapter III, IV].

Let $E$ be an elliptic curve given as

$$y^2 = 4x^3 - g_2x - g_3$$

with algebraic $g_2$ and $g_3$ such that $\Delta = g_3^3 - 27g_2^2 \neq 0$. For a pair of complex numbers $\omega_1, \omega_2$ with $\tau = \frac{\omega_2}{\omega_1}$ in the upper half plane $\mathbb{I} \tau > 0$ we write $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}\omega_1 + \mathbb{Z}\omega_2$ and consider the Weierstrass elliptic function

$$\wp(z; \Lambda) = \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{\omega \in \Lambda, \omega \neq 0} \left( \frac{1}{(z - \omega)^2} + \frac{1}{\omega^2} \right).$$

It gives a complex analytic uniformisation $(x, y) = (\wp(z; \Lambda), \wp'(z; \Lambda))$ of the elliptic curve with

$$g_2 = g_2(\Lambda) = 60 \sum_{\omega \neq 0} \frac{1}{\omega^2} \quad \text{and} \quad g_3 = g_3(\Lambda) = 140 \sum_{\omega \neq 0} \frac{1}{\omega^3}$$

and $\exp_E : z \mapsto (\wp(z), \wp'(z))$ gives the exponential map for $E$ as a complex Lie group. We obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \to \Lambda \to \mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{\exp_E} E^{\text{an}} \to 0,$$

which means that $E^{\text{an}} \simeq \mathbb{C}/\Lambda$. We also introduce the Weierstrass $\zeta$-function

$$\zeta(z; \Lambda) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{0 \neq \omega \in \Lambda} \left[ \frac{1}{(z - \omega)} + \frac{1}{\omega} + \frac{z}{\omega^2} \right].$$
and the Weierstrass $\sigma$-function
\[ \sigma(z; \Lambda) = z \prod_{0 \neq \omega \in \Lambda} (z - \frac{\omega}{\omega}) e^{\frac{z\omega}{2}}. \]

The three functions are related by the differential equations
\[ \frac{d}{dz} \log(\sigma(z; \Lambda)) = \zeta(z; \Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{d}{dz} \zeta(z, \Lambda) = -\varphi(z; \Lambda). \]

For $u \in \mathbb{C}$ fixed we put
\[ F(z; u) = \frac{\sigma(z - u)}{\sigma(z) \sigma(u)} e^{\zeta(u)z} \]
and one verifies that
\[ \frac{d \log F(z; u)}{dz} = \zeta(z - u) - \zeta(z) + \zeta(u). \]

Let $e_\infty = \exp_E(0)$ be the point of $E$ at infinity. Let $e_1, e_2, e_3$ be the other Weierstrass points of the elliptic curve $E$ determined by the zeroes of the equation $4x^3 - g_2x - g_3 = 0$. They are of the form $e_1 = \exp_E(\omega_1/2)$, $e_2 = \exp_E(\omega_2/2)$ and $e_3 = \exp_E((\omega_1 + \omega_2)/2)$ for a basis $\omega_1, \omega_2$ of $\Lambda$.

We fix a point $P = \exp_E(u)$ on $E^{an}$ and introduce differential forms on $E$ of the first, second and third kind
\[ \omega = \frac{dx}{y}, \quad \eta = \frac{x \, dx}{y} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_P = \frac{y + y(P) \, dx}{x - x(P) \, y}. \]

The functions $x$ and $y$ have polar divisor $2(e_\infty)$ and $3(e_\infty)$ respectively, $x - x(P)$ has a zero at $P$ and $-P$ because it is even and $y + y(P)$ is zero at $(-P)$ and two other points $P_1, P_2$. This shows that the divisor of $\xi_P$ is $-3(e_\infty) + (-P) + (P_1) + (P_2) - (-2(e_\infty) + (P) + (-P)) = -(e_\infty) - (P) + (P_1) + (P_2)$ and therefore
\[ (\xi_P) = ((P_1) + (P_2)) - ((e_\infty) + (P)). \]

We conclude that the polar divisor of $\xi_P$ is $(e_\infty) + (P)$. The residue of $\xi_P$ at $(e_\infty)$ is 1.

The exponential map for the plane elliptic curve $\mathbb{C} \to E^{an}$ is
\[ \exp_E: z \mapsto [\varphi(z) : \varphi'(z) : 1]. \]

Using equation (3.6) in [Cha85], Chap. IV, §3, one verifies that
\[ d \log F(z; u) = (\zeta(z - u) - \zeta(z) + \zeta(u)) \, dz \]
\[ = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varphi'(z) + \varphi'(u)}{\varphi(z) - \varphi(u)} \, dz = \exp_E^* \xi_P. \]

and obtains
\[ \exp_E^* \omega = dz, \quad \exp_E^* \eta = -d\zeta(z) \quad \text{and} \quad \exp_E^* \xi_P = d \log F(z, u). \]
We define $\eta = 2\zeta(\omega_i/2)$. Note that this agrees with the normalisation of [Ahl53 Section 3.2] and [Pri11a] but differs from [Cha85 Chapter IV.1 Theorem 1, Theorem 3]. The Weierstrass functions transform as
\[
\varphi(z + \omega_i) = \varphi(z), \\
\zeta(z + \omega_i) = \zeta(z) + \eta_i, \\
\sigma(z + \omega_i) = -\sigma(z) e^{\eta_i(z + \omega_i)}.
\]
\[
F(z + \omega_i, u) = F(z, u) e^{-\eta_iu \zeta(u)\omega_i} = F(z, u) e^{\lambda(u, \omega_i)}
\]
where $\lambda(u, \omega_i) = \zeta(u)\omega_i - \eta_iu$. This shows that the function $\varphi$ is periodic and the functions $\zeta$, $\sigma$ and $F$ are quasi-periodic with periods $\eta_i$, $e^{\eta_i(z + \omega_i)}$ and $e^{\lambda(u, \omega_i)}$. We extend $\lambda$ additively to a function on $\mathbb{C} \times \Lambda$. Note that we have $\lambda(\omega_1/2, \omega_2) = \pi i$ by the Legendre relation.

For $Q = \exp_E(v) \in E^{\text{an}}$, and $\gamma$ a path from $e_\infty$ to $Q$ the integral
\[
\omega(\gamma) = \int_{\infty}^Q \omega = \int_0^v \exp_E^* \omega = \int_0^v dz = v(\gamma)
\]
defines a multivalued map from $E^{\text{an}}$ to $\mathbb{C}$. For different paths from $e_\infty$ to $Q$ the integrals differ by a period $\omega \in \Lambda$. We get back the generators of $\Lambda$ as the periods
\[
\omega_1 = \omega(\epsilon_1) = \int_{\epsilon_1} \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_2 = \omega(\epsilon_2) = \int_{\epsilon_2} \omega
\]
taken along the basis $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2$ of $H_1^{\text{sing}}(E^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Z})$ defined as the image of the straight paths $[0, \omega_i]$ in $\mathbb{C}$. The integral $\omega(\gamma)$ is called incomplete period of the first kind and becomes a period (i.e., an element of $\Lambda$) if $\gamma(1) = e_\infty$.

For periods of the second kind the path $\gamma$ has to be taken in such a way that it does not contain the pole of $\eta$, i.e., the Weierstrass point $0 = e_\infty$. For the closed paths $\epsilon_1$ and $\epsilon_2$ we get back the quasiperiods $\eta_i = \eta(\epsilon_i)$ from above.

For the differentials of the third kind $\xi_P$ as above with polar divisor $(e_\infty) + (P)$ we have to consider in addition a closed path $\epsilon_0$ going once counterclockwise around $0$ with no other singularities inside and then $\lambda(u, \omega_i)$ and $2\pi i$ become complete periods of the third kind.

For incomplete periods of the second kind we take a path $\gamma$ with $\gamma(0) = \exp_E(v)$ and $\gamma(1) = \exp_E(v + w)$ which does not pass through $e_\infty$ and obtain by [Pri11a] (2) on p. 202
\[
\eta(\gamma) = \int_{\gamma} \eta = \int_v^{w + w} \exp_E^* (x \omega) = \int_v^{w + w} \varphi(z) dz = -\zeta(w + v) + \zeta(v)
\]
\[
= -\zeta(w) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varphi'(w) - \varphi'(v)}{\varphi(w) - \varphi(v)}
\]
\[
= -\zeta(w) + \alpha.
\]
In the case of interest for us, when $E$ is defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, then $\alpha$ is in fact algebraic.
Let $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{E}^{an}$ be a path of the form $\exp_{E} \circ \delta$ with $\delta : [0,1] \to \text{Lie} \mathcal{E}^{an}$ from $v$ to $w$ continuously differentiable and not containing any of the two poles of the differential of the third kind $\xi_P$.

$$\xi_P(\gamma) = \int_{\gamma} \xi_P = \int_{\exp \circ \delta} \xi_P = \int_{\delta} \exp^* \xi_P = \int_{\delta} \frac{F'(z,u)}{F(z,u)} \, dz$$

$$= \int_{\delta} F(z,u) \, \frac{dF}{dt} = \int_{\delta} \frac{dt}{t}$$

$$= \log_{F \circ \delta}(F \circ \delta(1)) - \log(F \circ \delta(0))$$

where $\log_{F \circ \delta}$ is the branch of the logarithm defined by analytically continuing $\log$ from $F(v,u)$ along $F \circ \delta$. Any two branches of $\log$ differ by an integral multiple of $2\pi i$. Up to such multiples $\log$ satisfies the usual functional equation, hence

$$\xi_P(\gamma) = \log \frac{F(w,u)}{F(v,u)} + 2\pi i \nu$$

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$.

In both cases one sees that if $\gamma$ is closed with period $\omega$ we get complete periods $\eta(\gamma)$ and $\xi_P(\gamma) = \lambda(u,\omega) + 2\pi i \nu$.

**Summary 10.1.** Let $\gamma : [0,1] \to \mathcal{E}^{an}$ be a path. Assume either that it is closed or has end points in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{Q})$. We write it as $\exp_{E} \circ \delta$ with $\delta$ a path in $\mathbb{C}$ with $\delta(0) = v$, $\delta(1) = v + w$. Let $\omega, \eta, \xi_P$ as in (11), $P = \exp_{E}(u)$.

$$\omega(\gamma) = w$$

$$\eta(\gamma) = -\zeta(w) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varphi'(w) - \varphi'(v)}{\varphi(w) - \varphi(v)}$$

$$\xi_P(\gamma) = \log \frac{F(v + w,u)}{F(v,u)} + 2\pi i \nu(\gamma).$$

Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ be the generators of $H_1(\mathcal{E}^{an}, \mathbb{Z})$. Then $\omega(\varepsilon_i) = \omega_i$ are the generators of the period lattice of $\mathcal{E}^{an}$, $\eta(\varepsilon_i) = \eta_i$ are the quasi-periods of $\mathcal{E}^{an}$ and $\xi_P(\varepsilon_i) = \lambda(u,\omega_i) + 2\pi i \nu$ for some $\nu(\gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

**Remark 10.2.** Every meromorphic differential form $\vartheta$ on $E$ can be written as

$$\vartheta = a \omega + b \eta + \sum_i c_i \xi_{P_i} + df$$

with $a,b,c_i \in \mathbb{Q}$, $P_i \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{Q})$, $f \in \mathcal{O}(E)^*$. Hence the above formulas can be put together to a computation of $\vartheta(\sigma)$ for any $\vartheta$ and chain $\sigma$.

**10.2. A calculation**

In order to get nice identities for incomplete periods we use the machinery exposed in [Frill1a, Frill1b].
Proposition 10.3. Let $P = \exp_E(u)$ and $Q = \exp_E(w)$ be distinct and non-zero and let $\delta : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{C}$ be a path from $-w$ to $w$ such that $\gamma = \exp_E \circ \delta$ does not pass through $P$. Then

$$\int_{-Q}^{Q} \xi_P := \int_{\gamma} \xi_P = 2 \log \frac{\sigma(u)\sigma(w)}{\sigma(w+u)} + 2\zeta(u)w + \log (-\varphi(w) + \varphi(u)) + 2\pi i \nu$$

for some $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the case $w = -u/2$ we write $P/2 = \exp_E(u/2)$ and then

$$\int_{-P/2}^{P/2} \xi_P := \int_{\gamma} \xi_P = 2 \log \sigma(u) - \zeta(u)u + \log \left(-\varphi\left(\frac{u}{2}\right) + \varphi(u)\right) + 2\pi i \nu.$$

Proof. Incomplete periods of elliptic integrals are up to integer multiples of $2\pi i$ of the form $\log \frac{F(w, u)}{F(v, u)}$. We specialise to $v = -w$. Going back to the definition of $F(w, u)$ we calculate

$$\frac{F(w, u)}{F(-w, u)} = \frac{\sigma(w-u)}{\sigma(-w-u)} \frac{\sigma(-w)}{\sigma(w)} e^{2\zeta(u)w} = \frac{\sigma(w-u)}{\sigma(w+u)} e^{2\zeta(u)w} = \frac{\sigma(w-u)\sigma(w+u)}{\sigma(w+u)^2} e^{2\zeta(u)w} = \frac{\sigma(u)^2 \sigma(w)^2}{\sigma(w+u)^2} (-\varphi(w) + \varphi(u)) e^{2\zeta(u)w}$$

using the identity

$$\frac{\sigma(v+u)\sigma(v-u)}{\sigma(v)^2 \sigma(u)^2} = -\varphi(v) + \varphi(u)$$

which we take from (14) in [Frill91] p. 217. This proves our first formula.

We continue with the choice $w = -\frac{u}{2}$ to get

$$\frac{F(-\frac{u}{2}, u)}{F(\frac{u}{2}, u)} = \sigma(u)^2 e^{-\zeta(u)u} (-\varphi\left(\frac{u}{2}\right)) + \varphi(u)) \right).$$

proving the second formula. $\square$

In the case of interest for us, $E$ is defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and the points $P$ and $Q$ are chosen in $E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. Then $\varphi(u)$ and $\varphi(u/2)$ are algebraic and hence $\int_{-P/2}^{P/2} \xi_P$ is equal to $2 \log \sigma(u) - \zeta(u)u$ modulo Baker periods and multiples of $2\pi i$.

10.3. Transcendence of incomplete periods

We now come back to Schneider’s Problem 3 mentioned in the introduction, see [Sch57] p. 138).

Theorem 10.4. Let $E$ be an elliptic curve over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$, $P \in E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$, $\omega, \eta, \xi_P$ the differential forms introduced above. Assume that $P$ is not torsion in $E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. Let $\kappa = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \gamma_i$ be a chain in $E^\text{an}$ avoiding $e_\infty$ and $P$ with boundary in
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$E(\overline{Q})$ and such that $P(\kappa) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i(\gamma_i(1) - \gamma_i(0)) \in E(\overline{Q})$ is not a torsion point. Then

$$1, 2\pi i, \omega(\kappa), \eta(\kappa), \xi_{P}(\kappa)$$

are $\overline{Q}$-linearly independent, in particular $\omega(\kappa), \eta(\kappa), \xi_{P}(\kappa)$ are transcendental.

**Proof.** Let $E^o = E \setminus \{e_\infty, P\}$. Let $D \subset E$ be the support of $\partial \kappa$. The chain $\kappa$ defines a homology class $[\kappa] \in H^1_{\text{sing}}(E^o, D; Q)$. The differential forms $\omega, \eta, \xi_P$ define classes in $H^1_{\text{dR}}(E^o, D)$. Hence we may view our periods as cohomological periods for $H^1(E^o, D)$ in the sense of Definition 6.2.

Let $J(E^o)$ be the generalised Jacobian, see Appendix B. We embed $\nu^o : E^o \to J(E^o)$ via a base point $P_0 \neq e_\infty, P$. Note that $J(E^o)$ is an extension of $E$ by $\mathbb{G}_m$. The assumption on $P$ ensures that it is non-split up to isogeny. The induced map $\nu : E \to J(E) \cong E$ is the shift by $P_0$.

By Lemma 10.2 the periods of $H^1(E^o, D)$ agree with the periods of the 1-motive $[\mathbb{Z}[D]^0 \to J(E^o)]$. Actually, the submotive $M = [\mathbb{Z} \to J(E^o)]$ with $1 \mapsto \tilde{P}(\kappa) := \sum_i a_i \nu^o(\gamma_i(1) - \gamma_i(0))$ suffices. Note that the image of $\tilde{P}(\kappa)$ in $E(\overline{Q})$ is $P(\kappa)$, independent of the choice of $P_0$. By assumption it is not torsion. Hence $M$ is reduced as a 1-motive (see Definition 9.3) and of the form considered in the elliptic curves example of Chapter 5 in Proposition 5.1 (non-CM case) or Proposition 5.2 (CM case). The class $[\kappa]$ is identified with an element $\lambda \in V_{\text{sing}}(M)$ as in their proofs such that the periods of $\lambda$ agree with the period integral of $\kappa$. The elements $1, 2\pi i, \omega(\kappa), \eta(\kappa), \xi_{P}(\kappa)$ are a subset of the basis considered there, in particular linearly independent. □

**Remark 10.5.**

(1) The assumption is satisfied for $\kappa = \gamma$ a single non-closed path with $\gamma(1) - \gamma(0)$ not torsion. In this case the period numbers were computed explicitly in Summary 10.1 in terms of the Weierstrass functions. The cases of integrals of the first and second kind are actually already due to Schneider, see [Sch57, Satz 15, p. 60]. The result is new for integrals of the third kind.

(2) The assumption on $P(\kappa)$ can be relaxed. We do not go into details here.

By specialising further we obtain the following explicit transcendence result.

**Theorem 10.6.** Let $u \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $\varphi(u) \in \overline{Q}$ and $\exp_E(u)$ is non-torsion in $E(\overline{Q})$. Then

$$u \zeta(u) - 2\log \sigma(u)$$

is transcendental.

**Proof.** Let $P = \exp_E(u)$. We choose a path $\delta$ from $u/2$ to $-u/2$ avoiding the singularities of $\xi_P$ and put $\gamma = \exp_E \circ \delta$. By Proposition 10.3 the period has the form

$$\xi_P(\gamma) = 2 \log \sigma(u) - \zeta(u)u + \log(\alpha) + 2\pi i \nu$$
for some algebraic $\alpha$. By Theorem 10.4 it is transcendental, but this is not enough. If

$$2\log \sigma(u) - \zeta(u)u = \xi_P(u) - \log(\alpha) - 2\pi i$$

was algebraic, then we would have a linear dependence relation between $1, \xi_P(\gamma), \log(\alpha), 2\pi i$.

To obtain a contradiction, it suffices to show that they are $\overline{Q}$-linearly independent. (Unless when $\alpha$ is a root of unity and $\log(\alpha)$ a rational multiple of $2\pi i$. Then the element $\log(\alpha)$ can be dropped from the list and the linear independence is already shown in Theorem 10.4.)

Note that $\log(\alpha)$ is a Baker period in the sense of Section 9.3, i.e., it is the period of a Baker motive $M_0 = [\mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{G}_m]$ with $1 \mapsto \alpha$. The number $\xi_P(\gamma)$ is an incomplete period of the third kind of $M_1 = [\mathbb{Z} \to J(E^\circ)]$ as in the proof of Theorem 10.4.

Linear independence could be addressed by applying the techniques of Chapter 9 directly to $M_0 \times M_1$. Instead we explain the deduction from the general results proved there.

As shown in Chapter 5 we have $\delta_{inc3}(M_1) = 1$. This means that $\xi_P(\gamma)$ is a non-zero element of $\mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M_1)$ (see Section 9.3). We have $\mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M_1) \subset \mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M_1^{sat})$ for $M_1^{sat}$ a saturation of $M_1$ as constructed in Section 9.7. By Theorem 9.5 [4] $\log(\alpha)$ and $\xi_P(\gamma)$ are linearly independent in

$$\mathcal{P}_{inc3}(M_0 \times M_1^{sat}) = \mathcal{P}(M_0) / \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{G}_m \times J(E^\circ)) + \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z} \to E).$$

The numbers $1, 2\pi i$ are in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{G}_m \times J(E^\circ)) + \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{Z} \to E)$ and linearly independent either by Lindemann’s result or from Theorem 9.2. Hence all four are linearly independent and $u \xi(u) - 2\log(\sigma(u))$ is transcendental.  

\section{10.4. Elliptic period space}

Suppose now that $E$ is an elliptic curve defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\omega, \eta$ and $\xi_k = \xi_{P_k}, 1 \leq k \leq n$ the differentials of the first, second and third kind on $E$ with $P_k = \exp_\omega(u_k) \in E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. We choose non-closed paths $\gamma_i : [0, 1] \to E^\text{an}$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ with $\gamma_i(0), \gamma_i(1) \in E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$.

\textbf{Definition 10.7.} The period space $W = W(E, P_k, \gamma_i)$ is generated over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ by

$$1, 2\pi i, \omega_1, \omega_2, \eta_1, \eta_2, \lambda(u_k, \omega_1), \lambda(u_k, \omega_2), \omega(\gamma_i), \eta(\gamma_i), \xi_{P_k}(\gamma_i)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$.

We shall show that $W$ can be identified with the period space of a 1-motive. Let $S = \{0, P_1, \ldots, P_n\} \subset E$ and $D$ the union of the supports of $\partial \gamma_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$. Put $E^\circ = E \setminus S$. Consider $H^1(E^\circ, D)$. By Lemma 6.9 its periods agree with the periods of the 1-motive $M' = [\mathbb{Z}[D]^{\text{sat}}] \to J(E^\circ)$. Let $L \subset \mathbb{Z}[D]^{\text{sat}}$ be generated by $\partial \gamma_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and put

$$M = [L \to J(E^\circ)].$$
The lattice $L$ has rank $m$. We abbreviate $G = J(E^o)$. It has abelian part $E$ and a torus part $T$ of rank $n$.

**Proposition 10.8.**

$$W = \mathcal{P}(M).$$

**Proof.** We start by choosing generators for $V_{\text{sing}}(M) \subset V_{\text{sing}}(M') \cong H_1^{\text{sing}}(E^{o,an}, D; \mathbb{Q})$.

Let $\sigma_0, \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n$ be small loops around the points in $S$. They generate $V_{\text{sing}}([0 \to T])$. Let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2$ loops in $E^{an}$ whose images in $E^{an}$ generate $H_1^{\text{sing}}(E^{an}, \mathbb{Z})$. Finally, view $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m$ as paths in $E^{c,an}$. By definition,

$$\sigma_0, \ldots, \sigma_n, \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m$$

generate $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$.

We turn to $V_{\text{dR}}^0(M)$. It is a quotient of $H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^o, D)$. We choose exact differential form $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ generating the kernel of $H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^o, D) \to H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^o)$. We view $\omega, \eta, \xi_{P_1}, \ldots, \xi_{P_n}$ as elements of $H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^o, D)$ and claim that the set $u_1, \ldots, u_n, \omega, \eta, \xi_{P_1}, \ldots, \xi_{P_n}$ generates the whole cohomomology. Obviously $u_1, \ldots, u_n, \omega, \eta$ generate $H_{\text{dR}}^1(E, D)$, hence it remains to show that the $\xi_{P_i}$ generate

$$H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^o, D)/H_{\text{dR}}^1(E, D) \cong H_{\text{dR}}^1(E^{c,an})/H_{\text{dR}}^1(E) \cong \ker(H_{\text{dR}}^0(S) \to H_{\text{dR}}^0(E)).$$

The isomorphism maps a logarithmic form $\vartheta$ with polar divisor included in $S$ to its residue vector $(\text{res}_0 \vartheta, \text{res}_{P_1} \vartheta, \ldots, \text{res}_{P_n} \vartheta)$. Hence $\xi_{P_i} \mapsto (1, 0, \ldots, -1, 0 \ldots)$ with $-1$ in place $i$. Together they generate the kernel as claimed.

Hence the period matrix of $M$ has the shape

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
\xi_{P_1}(\sigma_j) & \xi_{P_1}(\varepsilon_j) & \xi_{P_1}(\gamma_i) \\
0 & \omega(\varepsilon_j) & \omega(\gamma_i) \\
0 & \eta(\varepsilon_j) & \eta(\gamma_i) \\
0 & 0 & u_i(\gamma_j)
\end{pmatrix} = 
\begin{pmatrix}
2\pi i \alpha_{ij} & \lambda(u_i, \omega_j) + 2\pi \nu_j & \xi_{P_i}(\gamma_i) \\
0 & \omega_i & \omega(\gamma_j) \\
0 & \eta_i & \eta(\gamma_j) \\
0 & 0 & \beta_{ij}
\end{pmatrix},
$$

with $\alpha_{ij}, \beta_{ij} \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\nu_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. The entries generate $W$. \qed

Theorem 9.2 gives a formula for the dimension of $W$. With the notation introduced there:

**Theorem 10.9.** Let $E/\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ elliptic with $e = \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \text{End}(E).$ Then

$$\dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} W = 1 + \frac{4}{e} + 1 + 2\text{rk}_E(T, M) + 2\text{rk}_E(L, M) + \delta_{\text{inc}_3}(M)$$

If $M$ is saturated, then $\delta_{\text{inc}_3}(M) = e \text{rk}_E(T, M) \text{rk}_E(L, M)$.

Note that $M$ is not reduced in general. If $L \to E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_Q$ or $X(T) \to E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})_Q$ have a kernel, this implies that suitable Baker periods (i.e. values of log in algebraic numbers) are contained in $W$. This happens for example if the end point of a path or one of the $P_k$ are torsion points in $E(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. The situation simplifies if we exclude this case.
Corollary 10.10. Assume that $E$ does not have CM, $n = \text{rk}(P_1, \ldots, P_n) \subset E(\mathbb{Q})$, $m = \text{rk}(\gamma_i(1) - \gamma_i(0) | i = 1, \ldots, m) \subset E(\mathbb{Q})$. Then
\[
\dim W = 6 + 2(n + m) + nm.
\]

Proof. The assumptions imply $e(E) = 1$, $M$ saturated and $n = \text{rk}_E(T, M)$, $m = \text{rk}_E(L, M)$. \hfill \Box

10.4.1. With CM. The CM case is a lot more complicated, even if $M$ is reduced. We consider an example with small rank $n = m = 2$, hence $M = [L \to G]$ reduced with $L \cong \mathbb{Z}^2$, $G$ an extension of an elliptic curve $E$ by the torus $T = \mathbb{G}_m^2$.

Assume $E$ has CM, hence $K = \text{End}_\mathbb{Q}(E)$ is an imaginary quadratic field, and in this case $e = 2$. Hence $\text{rk}_E(L, M)$ and $\text{rk}_E(T, M)$ can take the values 1 and 2. We have

Lemma 10.11.
\[
\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = \begin{cases} 
2 & M \text{ saturated} \\
4 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. We show that if there is a non-zero element in $R_{\text{inc3}}(M)$ then $M$ is saturated. We go back to the Definition 9.1 and choose a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $l_1, l_2$ of $L \subset E(\mathbb{Q})$ which is used to identify $L^\vee \otimes E \cong E^2$ as before. Hence $c = (l_1, l_2)$. Let $(\alpha, y, x)$ a triple satisfying the conditions in Definition 9.1 with $y \neq 0$. First consider $\alpha : E^2 \to E^2$. We may view it as an element of $M_2(K)$. Condition (B) implies that $\alpha(c) = \alpha(l_1, l_2) = 0$. There are three possible cases, depending on the rank of $\alpha$.

If $\alpha$ is invertible, then the non-zero vector $(l_1, l_2)$ cannot be mapped to 0. This case does not occur.

If $\alpha$ has rank 1, it suffices to consider $\alpha' : E^2 \to \alpha(E) \cong E$. We replace $\alpha$ by $\alpha'$ in the arguments and $x, y$ by their images in $E$ and $X(T)$. The new $\alpha$ has shape $(m, n)$ for $m, n \in K$. The image of $c$ in $E$ is $ml_1 + nl_2 = 0$ by assumption. Without loss of generality, $m \neq 0$, hence it is invertible. We replace $\alpha$ by $m^{-1} \circ \alpha$ and then $m = 1$, $l_1 + nl_2 = 0$. As $l_1$ and $l_2$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly independent, this implies $n \in K \setminus \mathbb{Q}$. The image of $L$ in $E(\mathbb{Q})$ contains $l_2$ and $-nl$. As $1, -n$ are a $\mathbb{Q}$-basis of $K$, this implies that $Kl_2 \subset L$. As $L$ has $\mathbb{Q}$-rank 2, this even implies $L \cong Kl_2$. In other words: $L$ is $K$-stable in $E(\mathbb{Q})$ and we have $\text{rk}_E(L, M) = 1$.

We continue with the diagram (A) of Definition 9.1. The adjoint of $\alpha$ is of the form $(1, n^\vee) : E \to E^2$, hence $y = \alpha^\vee(x) = (x, n^\vee(x)) \in X(T)^2$. Hence $x$ is a non-zero element of $X(T)$ and its image under $n^\vee \in K$ is again in $X(T)$. Hence also $X(T)$ is $K$-stable and $\text{rk}_E(T, M) = 1$. This implies that the operation of $K$ on $E$ extends to an operation on $G$. The map in (A) is $G^2 \to G$ given by $(1, n)$. Condition (B) asks for $l_1 + nl_2 = 0$. If so this implies that $L \subset G(\mathbb{Q})$ is $K$-stable, which means that $M$ is saturated. In this case $\delta_{\text{inc3}}(M) = e\text{rk}_E(L, M)\text{rk}_E(T, M) = 2$. 
It remains to consider the case $\alpha = 0$, in which the condition $[L^\vee \otimes G]^* (y) = \alpha^* (x) = 0$ implies $y = 0$. 

Hence the possible values for $\delta(M)$ in the CM-case are 16, 14, 12, 10. This contrasts with 18 in the non-CM case.

10.5. Values of hypergeometric functions

We review how our knowledge on periods of curves and 1-motives can also be used to deduce transcendence results for certain values of hypergeometric functions. The result can be found as a special case of Wolfart’s [Wol88]. We explain the method because it should generalise to many other cases.

Recall that for $|\lambda| < 1$ the hypergeometric function with parameters $(1/2, 1/2, 1)$ is defined by the converging power series

$$F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 1; t\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_n \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)_n}{n!} \frac{t^n}{n!}$$

where we have used the Pochhammer symbol $(a)_n = a(a+1)+\cdots+(a+n-1)$ for $n > 0$ and 1 for $n = 0$. It is a solution of the hypergeometric differential equation

$$\lambda(\lambda - 1) \phi'' + (2\lambda - 1) \phi' + \frac{1}{4} \phi = 0.$$ 

Hence the function extends to a multi-valued holomorphic function on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$.

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. We consider the elliptic integral

$$I(\lambda) = \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{u(1-u)(1-\lambda u)}} \, du.$$

The differential form

$$\xi(\lambda) = \frac{du}{\sqrt{u(1-u)(1-\lambda u)}}$$

is multivalued, so the integral $I(\lambda)$ depends on choices. They differ by a sign. On $(0, 1)$ there is a preferred choice given by the positive branch of the root. A classic computation due to Euler (see [Kle81, p.7]) shows that for $\lambda \in [0, 1]$

$$I(\lambda) = B\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 1; \lambda\right)$$

where $B$ is Euler’s beta function and $F$ denotes Gauss’s hypergeometric function. As both sides are analytic in $\lambda$, the equality extends to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\}$ as long as we follow the same path on both sides. The equality still holds up to sign if we allow a switch of branch.

The computation is achieved by viewing both sides as functions in $\lambda$, carrying out a The computation is achieved by viewing both sides as functions
in \( \lambda \), carrying out a power series expansion of \( \omega(\lambda) \) at \( \lambda = 0 \) and integrating term by term. By definition By definition

\[
B(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = \int_0^1 u^{-1/2} (1 - u)^{-1/2} du = \frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{1}{2})}{\Gamma(1)} = \pi.
\]

So, for all \( \lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0, 1\} \).

(14)

\[
I(\lambda) = \pm \pi F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1; \lambda\right).
\]

On the other hand, \( I(\lambda) \) is a period. Let \( C_\lambda \) be the elliptic curve in Legendre form with affine equation

\[
y^2 = u(1 - u)(1 - \lambda u).
\]

The multivalued differential form \( \xi(\lambda) \) lifts to a single valued form \( \omega(\lambda) \) on \( C^\text{an}_\lambda \). Indeed,

\[
\omega(\lambda) = \frac{du}{y}.
\]

The projection \( \pi : C_\lambda \to \mathbb{P}^1 \) mapping \((u, y)\) to \( u \) is 2-fold cover ramified in \( u = 0, 1, \lambda^{-1}, \infty \). These are the 2-torsion points of \( C_\lambda \). The path \([0, 1]\) in \( \mathbb{C} \) has two lifts \( \gamma_1(\lambda), \gamma_2(\lambda) \) to \( C^\text{an}_\lambda \). The integrals

\[
\int_{\gamma_i(\lambda)} \omega(\lambda)
\]

are the two possible choices for \( I(\lambda) \). By definition this is an incomplete integral of the first kind on the elliptic curve \( C_\lambda \). However, as the end points are torsion points, they actually agree with a closed elliptic integral of the first kind on \( C_\lambda/C_\lambda[2] \). Alternatively, we can use the Pochhammer cycle so write \( I(\lambda) \) as an explicit closed elliptic integral of the first kind. This approach also fixes the choice of branch. We refer to \([\text{Kle81}, \S 13]\) for details.

Either way, Theorem 8.9 implies that \( I(\lambda) \) is transcendental for \( \lambda \) is algebraic. Hence Equation (14) is a linear relation between the elliptic period \( I(\lambda) \) and \( \pi \). However, they are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Hence:

**Proposition 10.12** (Wolfart \([\text{Wol88}]\)). For \( z \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0, 1\} \), the value \( F(1/2, 1/2, 1; z) \) of the hypergeometric function is transcendental.

**Remark 10.13.** An alternative proof is suggested by the explicit computation of \( F(1/2, 1/2, 1; z) \) given in \([\text{Arc03}, \text{Remark 6}]\): Let \( \lambda(\tau) \) be the modular function associated with the group \( \Gamma(2) \subset SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). Archinard claims that

(15) \[
F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1; \lambda(\tau)\right) = 2^{\frac{1}{4}} 3^{-\frac{1}{4}} \pi g_2(\tau)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\lambda^2(\tau) - \lambda(\tau) + 1)^{\frac{1}{4}}.
\]

If \( \lambda(\tau) \) is algebraic, then so are \( j(\tau) \) and \( g_2(\tau) \), hence we would deduce

\[
F(1/2, 1/2, 1; \lambda(\tau)) \in \mathbb{Q}^+ \pi
\]
for algebraic \( \lambda(\tau) \). This seems to fit with the proposition. However, it would also imply

\[
I(\lambda(\tau)) \in \mathbb{Q}^* \pi^2
\]

for all algebraic \( \lambda(\tau) \). For \( \tau_1 \) and \( \tau_2 \) such that \( \lambda(\tau_1) \) and \( \lambda(\tau_2) \) algebraic we may eliminate \( \pi^2 \) and get a period relation between \( I(\lambda(\tau_1)) \) and \( I(\lambda(\tau_2)) \) between periods of two elliptic curves with algebraic coefficients. This implies that the curves are isogenous. As a consequence all \( C_\lambda \) for algebraic \( \lambda \) are isogenous, clearly a false statement. Indeed, Equation (15) cannot hold because the left hand side is a modular form of weight 0, whereas the right hand side is of weight \(-1\).

We now give a more conceptual formulation of the ingredients of the proof of Equation (13). We consider the Legendre family

\[
p : C \to \mathbb{P}^1
\]

with fibre at \( \lambda \) the curve \( C_\lambda \) introduced above. It has degenerate fibers above \( 0, 1, \infty \). A global basis of \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(C_\lambda) \) is given by the two differential forms

\[
\omega(\lambda) = \frac{du}{y}, \quad \eta(\lambda) = \frac{udu}{y}
\]

The form \( \omega(\lambda) \) is holomorphic and hence of the first kind whereas \( \eta(t) \) has a pole of order 2 at \( u = \infty \) and this means that it is of the second kind. We concentrate on \( \omega(\lambda) \).

Let \( s \in S = \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\} \) be fixed and let \( \gamma_s \) be a cycle in \( C_s \). By parallel transport we can get a horizontal lifting \( \gamma(\lambda) \) of the cycle \( \gamma_s \) which a priori depends on an Ehresmann connection. But the homology class of the cycle \( \gamma(\lambda) \) is independent of the choice of the connection. This gives a horizontal family of homology classes of cycles. On taking periods along the horizontal cycle one gets multi-valued analytic functions on \( S \) given by periods

\[
z(\lambda) := \int_{\gamma(\lambda)} \omega(\lambda)
\]

which are a solutions of the hypergeometric differential equation

\[
u(u-1)\lambda'' + (2u-1)\lambda' + \frac{1}{4}\lambda = 0.
\]

A basis for the spaces of solutions is given by the pair

\[
z_0(\lambda) := F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 1; \lambda\right)
\]

\[
z_1(\lambda) := -iF\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}; 1; 1 - \lambda\right).
\]

On the other hand, our period \( I(\lambda) \) is one of the integrals over \( \gamma(\lambda) \). Indeed, the path of integration has its end points in the 2-torsion points on \( C_\lambda \). It defines a horizontal element of \( H^1_{\text{sing}}(C_\lambda; \mathbb{Q}) \). Hence a priori, \( I(\lambda) \) is a constant linear combination of \( z_0(\lambda) \) and \( z_1(\lambda) \). The coefficients (i.e., Equation (13)) are determined by degenerating to the singular fibre \( \lambda = 0 \).
We hope that in the future the same methods will be applied in other degenerating families of pure or mixed Hodge structure.
Part 4

Appendices
APPENDIX A

The analytic subgroup theorem

Let $G$ be an algebraic group, commutative, connected and defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra. The associated complex manifold $G^{an}$ is a complex Lie group and its Lie algebra is $\mathfrak{g}_C = \mathfrak{g} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. The exponential map

$$\exp_G : \mathfrak{g}_C \to G^{an}$$

from the Lie algebra into $G^{an}$ defines an analytic homomorphism. If $\mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a subalgebra and $\mathfrak{b}_C = \mathfrak{b} \otimes \mathbb{C}$ we denote by $B$ the analytic subgroup $\exp_G(\mathfrak{b}_C)$. An obvious question one can ask is whether $B(\mathbb{Q}) = B \cap G(\mathbb{Q})$ can contain an algebraic point different from 0, the neutral element. The answer is given by the analytic subgroup theorem.

**Theorem A.1** (\cite{Wuss87}, \cite{Wuss89}). The group of algebraic points $B(\mathbb{Q})$ is non-trivial if and only if there is an algebraic subgroup $H \subseteq G$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}$ such that $\{0\} \neq \mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$.

We conclude that the only source for algebraic points is the obvious one. Note that $B(\mathbb{Q}) \neq \{0\}$ implies that $\mathfrak{b} \neq \{0\}$. There is a refined version of the theorem. To state it let $G$ be a connected commutative algebraic group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ with Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and let $\langle \cdot , \cdot \rangle$ be the duality pairing between $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ and $\mathfrak{g}$. For $u \in \mathfrak{g}_C$ with $\exp_G(u) \in G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$ we denote by $\text{Ann}(u)$ the largest subspace of $\mathfrak{g}^\vee$ such that $\langle \text{Ann}(u), u \rangle = 0$.

**Theorem A.2.** Assume that $\exp_G(u) \in G(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})$. Then there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \to H \to G \xrightarrow{\pi} G/H \to 0$$

of algebraic groups defined over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ such that $\text{Ann}(u) = \pi^*(\mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h})^\vee$ and $u \in \mathfrak{h}_C$, where $\mathfrak{h}$ is the Lie algebra of $H$.

**Proof.** Let $\langle \cdot , \cdot \rangle : \mathfrak{g}^\vee \times \mathfrak{g} \to \overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ be the duality pairing and for any subalgebra $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ denote by

$$\mathfrak{a}^\perp = \{ \lambda \in \mathfrak{g}^\vee : \langle \lambda, \mathfrak{a} \rangle = 0 \}$$

the left kernel. The right kernel is defined similarly. We put $\mathfrak{b} := \text{Ann}(u)^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$. Then $\mathfrak{b}_C$ contains $u$ and Theorem A.1 leads to $u \in \mathfrak{h}_C \subseteq \mathfrak{b}_C$ for $\mathfrak{h}$ the Lie algebra of an algebraic subgroup $H \subseteq G$. Taking the left kernels gives $\mathfrak{b}^\perp \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^\perp$ and then $\mathfrak{b}^\perp = \text{Ann}(u) = \mathfrak{h}^\perp$ by the maximality property of $\text{Ann}(u)$. We get an exact sequence of Lie algebras

$$0 \to \mathfrak{h} \to \mathfrak{g} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathfrak{g}/\mathfrak{h} \to 0$$
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which corresponds to an exact sequence

\[ 0 \to H \to G \to G/H \to 0 \]

of algebraic groups and by duality to the exact sequence

\[ 0 \to (g/h)^\vee \xrightarrow{\pi^*} g^\vee \to h^\vee \to 0. \]

We have \( h^\perp = \pi^*(g/h)^\vee \) and \( (g/h)^\perp = h^\vee \), which we prove as follows: We have \( \lambda \in h^\perp \) if and only if \( \lambda \) restricts to zero on \( h \). This implies that \( \lambda \) descends to \( g/h \) and that there is an element \( \mu \in (g/h)^\vee \) with \( \lambda = \pi^*\mu \). This leads to \( h^\perp \subseteq \pi^*(g/h)^\vee \). Conversely

\[ \langle \pi^*(g/h)^\vee, h \rangle = \langle (g/h)^\vee, \pi^*h \rangle = 0 \]

since \( \pi^*h = 0 \) and we conclude that \( \text{Ann}(\lambda) = h^\perp = \pi^*(g/h)^\vee \) as stated. □

The subgroup theorem also has a consequence for the category of groups itself. A connected commutative algebraic group over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) gives rise to a complex Lie group. We call morphisms in the category of complex Lie groups analytic homomorphisms.

**Theorem A.3.** Let \( G, G' \) be connected commutative algebraic groups defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) with Lie algebras \( g \) and \( g' \) and let \( \phi : G^\text{an} \to G'^\text{an} \) be an analytic group homomorphism such that \( g_C \to g'_C \) maps \( g \) to \( g' \).

Then there exists a vector group \( V_{\text{tr}} \), a connected commutative algebraic group \( G_{\text{alg}} \) and a decomposition

\[ G \cong V_{\text{tr}} \times G_{\text{alg}} \]

such that \( \phi|_{G_{\text{alg}}} \) is algebraic over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) and \( \phi|_{V_{\text{tr}}} \) is purely transcendental, i.e., \( \phi(V_{\text{tr}}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}})) \) does not contain any non-zero algebraic values.

**Remark A.4.** (1) An earlier version claimed the same corollary but without the \( V_{\text{tr}} \)-factor. We thank the referee for pointing out the mistake in the argument. Indeed, the statement is false as the example \( \exp : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^* \) shows. The Theorem says that all counterexamples are of a similar nature, see Corollary A.9 for a complete classification.

(2) The assumption on the induced map on Lie algebras is necessary as the following example shows: let \( G_1 = \mathbb{G}_m \), and \( G_2 = E \) an elliptic curve over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). Let

\[ C \xrightarrow{z \mapsto \exp(2\pi iz)} \mathbb{C}^* = G_{\text{an}}^\text{m} \]

the standard uniformisation. For \( E_{\text{an}} \) we use the explicit uniformisation

\[ \exp_E : \mathbb{C} \to E_{\text{an}} \]

with kernel \( \Lambda = \mathbb{Z}\omega_1 + \mathbb{Z}\omega_2 \) of Section 10.1. In these coordinates the \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-coLie algebras of \( \mathbb{G}_m \) and \( E \) are generated by \( dz/z \) and \( dz \) respectively.
We get a well-defined analytic homomorphism
\[ \phi : \mathbb{G}_m^{an} = \mathbb{C}/2\pi i \mathbb{Z} \to E^{an} = \mathbb{C}/\Lambda \]
by \( z \mapsto (\omega_1/2\pi i)z \). It is not algebraic. This does not contradict Theorem A.3 because neither does it map \( g_1 \) to \( g_2 \): \( \omega_1/2\pi i \) is not in \( \mathbb{Q} \).

The proof of the Theorem will take the rest of this appendix.

**Lemma A.5.** Suppose that the set of torsion points \( G_{tor} \) is dense in \( G \). Under the assumptions of Theorem A.3, the morphism \( \phi \) is algebraic.

**Proof.** Let \( B \subset G^{an} \times G^{ran} \) be the graph of \( \phi \). It is connected because it is isomorphic to \( G^{an} \) via the first projection. By assumption its Lie algebra is defined over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Let \( g \in G(\mathbb{Q}) \) be an \( N \)-torsion point. Then \( \phi(g) \in G'(\mathbb{C}) \) is also an \( N \)-torsion point, hence in \( G'(\mathbb{Q}) \). This implies that
\[ T := \{(g, \phi(g)) | g \in G_{tor}\} \subset B(\mathbb{Q}). \]
By the analytic subgroup theorem there is an algebraic subgroup \( H \subset G \times G' \) defined over \( \mathbb{Q} \) such that \( H^{an} \subset B \) and containing all of \( T \). The projection \( B \to G^{an} \times G^{ran} \to G^{an} \) is an isomorphism, hence its restriction to \( H \) is a closed immersion. The image contains the set \( G_{tor} \). It is Zariski dense, hence the inclusion is surjective. In other words, \( H^{an} = B \). The group \( H \subset G \times G' \) is the graph of the morphism we wanted to find. \( \square \)

**Lemma A.6.** The Theorem holds if \( G = V \) is a vector group.

**Proof.** Let \( \Sigma = \phi^{-1}(G'(\mathbb{Q})) \cap V(\mathbb{Q}) \). We denote by \( V_\Sigma \subset V \) the smallest algebraic subgroup containing \( \Sigma \). We choose a direct complement \( V_{tr} \) of \( V_\Sigma \) in \( V \). By construction, \( \phi|_{V_{tr}} \) is purely transcendental. Indeed, any \( \sigma \in V_{tr}(\mathbb{Q}) \) with \( \phi(\sigma) \in G'_{}(\mathbb{Q}) \) is already in \( \Sigma \) and hence in \( V_\Sigma(\mathbb{Q}) \).

It remains to show that \( \phi|_{V_{\Sigma}} \) is algebraic. As in the last lemma we consider its graph \( B \) in \( V_{\Sigma}^{an} \times G^{ran}_{\Sigma} \). Its Lie algebra is defined over \( \mathbb{Q} \) and it contains the set
\[ T := \{(g, \phi(g)) | g \in \Sigma\} \subset B(\mathbb{Q}). \]
By the analytic subgroup theorem there is an algebraic subgroup \( H \subset V_\Sigma \times G' \) defined over \( \mathbb{Q} \) such that \( H^{an} \subset B \) and containing all of \( T \). The projection \( B \to V_{\Sigma}^{an} \times G^{ran}_{\Sigma} \to V_{\Sigma}^{an} \) is an isomorphism, hence its restriction to \( H \) is a closed immersion. The image is an algebraic subgroup containing the set \( \Sigma \), hence equal to \( V_\Sigma \). In other words, again \( H^{an} = B \). The group \( H \subset G \times G' \) is the graph of the morphism we wanted to find. \( \square \)

**Lemma A.7.** Let \( G_1 \to G_2 \) be a vector extension. Then \( (G_1)_{tor} = (G_2)_{tor} \).

**Proof.** It suffices to check the statement over the complex numbers and in the analytification. We have
\[ G_1^{an} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n_1}/H_1(G_1^{an}, \mathbb{Z}) \to G_2^{an} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n_2}/H_1(G_2^{an}, \mathbb{Z}). \]
By homotopy invariance, \( H_1(G_{\text{an}}^1, \mathbb{Z}) \cong H_1(G_{\text{an}}^2, \mathbb{Z}) \). The torsion is computed as \( G_{i, \text{tor}} \cong H_1(G_{i}^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Z}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z} \), hence it is also isomorphic. \( \square \)

Let \( V \) be the vector part of \( G \), i.e., we have short exact sequence

\[
0 \to V \to G \to G^{\text{sa}} \to 0
\]

with \( V \) a vector group and \( G^{\text{sa}} \) semi-abelian. We say that \( G \) is completely non-trivial (as vector extension) if it does not have a direct factor \( G_a \). In other words: the classifying map

\[
V^\vee \to \text{Ext}^1(G^{\text{sa}}, G_a)
\]

is injective, see Section 6.3 in [Wüs18].

**Lemma A.8.** Let \( G_1 \) be the Zariski closure of \( G_{\text{tor}} \) in \( G \). Then \( G_1 \) is a completely non-trivial vector extension of \( G^{\text{sa}} \). Moreover, there is a decomposition

\[
G \cong V_1 \times G_1
\]

with a vector group \( V_1 \), i.e., \( G_1 \) is the maximal completely non-trivial subextension of \( G^{\text{sa}} \) contained in \( G \).

**Proof.** We have \( G_{\text{tor}} \cong G_{\text{tor}}^{\text{sa}} \), hence the image of \( G_1 \to G^{\text{sa}} \) contains all torsion points. They are dense in \( G^{\text{sa}} \), hence \( G_1 \to G^{\text{sa}} \) is surjective. This makes \( G_1 \) a vector extension of \( G^{\text{sa}} \). By construction, \((G_1)_{\text{tor}}\) is dense in \( G_1 \). If it was not completely non-trivial, we would have a decomposition \( G_1 = G_2 \times G_a \) and the torsion points would not be dense.

Finally, let \( V \) be the vector part of \( G \), \( W = G_1 \cap V \) and choose a direct complement \( V_1 \) of \( W \) in \( V \). The natural map

\[
G_1 \times V_1 \to G
\]

is an isomorphism. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem \([A.3]\)** By Lemma \([A.8]\) we have

\[
G \cong G_1 \times V_1
\]

such \( G_{\text{tor}} \) is dense in \( G_1 \) and \( V_1 \) is a vector group. By Lemma \([A.5]\), the theorem holds for \( G_1 \).

By Lemma \([A.6]\), there is a decomposition \( V_1 \cong (V_1)_\Sigma \times V_\text{tr} \) such that \( \phi \) is algebraic on \((V_1)_\Sigma\) and purely transcendental on \( V_\text{tr} \). This finishes the proof. \( \square \)

The interplay between algebraic and transcendental morphisms is subtle. In the situation of Theorem \([A.3]\) let

\[
G \cong V_1 \times G_1, \quad G' \cong V_2 \times G_2
\]

be their decompositions into a vector group and a completely non-trivial vector extension of its semi-abelian part as in Lemma \([A.8]\). The analytic homomorphism \( \phi \) decomposes as a \( 2 \times 2 \)-matrix
\[
\phi = \begin{pmatrix}
\phi_{11} & \phi_{12} \\
\phi_{21} & \phi_{22}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

with \( \phi_{11} \in \text{Hom}(V_{1}^{\text{an}}, V_{2}^{\text{an}}) \), \( \phi_{12} \in \text{Hom}(V_{1}^{\text{an}}, G_{2}^{\text{an}}) \) and with \( \phi_{21} \in \text{Hom}(G_{1}^{\text{an}}, V_{2}^{\text{an}}) \) and \( \phi_{22} \in \text{Hom}(G_{1}^{\text{an}}, G_{2}^{\text{an}}) \).

**Corollary A.9.** In this situation, we have:

1. \( \phi_{11} \) and \( \phi_{22} \) are algebraic and defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \);
2. \( \phi_{21} = 0 \);
3. There is a decomposition \( V_{1} \cong V_{1,\text{tr}} \times V_{1,\text{alg}} \) such that the map induced by \( \phi_{12}|_{V_{1,\text{tr}}} \):

\[
V_{1,\text{tr}}^{\text{an}} \to G_{2,\text{sa}}^{\text{an}}
\]

is purely transcendental and \( \phi_{12}|_{V_{1,\text{alg}}} \) is algebraic and defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \).

**Proof.** By the proof of Theorem A.3, we have \( G_{1} \subset G_{\text{alg}} \) and \( V_{\text{tr}} \subset V_{1} \). In particular, \( \phi_{21} \) and \( \phi_{22} \) are algebraic and defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \). If \( \phi_{21} : G_{1}^{\text{an}} \to V_{2}^{\text{an}} \) was non-zero, we would be able to split off a factor \( \mathbb{G}_{a} \) from \( G_{1} \). This is impossible because \( G_{1} \) is completely non-trivial.

All analytic homomorphisms \( \phi_{11} : V_{1}^{\text{an}} \to V_{2}^{\text{an}} \) are algebraic over \( \mathbb{C} \). It agrees with the analytification of the \( \mathbb{C} \)-linear map \( v_{1,\mathbb{C}} \to v_{2,\mathbb{C}} \). By assumption it is induced by a \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \)-linear map \( v_{1} \to v_{2} \), hence it is even algebraic over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \).

We decompose \( V_{1} \) as in Theorem A.3 in this special case. Hence \( \phi_{12} \) is algebraic and defined over \( \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \) on \( V_{1,\text{alg}} \) and purely transcendental on \( V_{1,\text{tr}} \). It remains to show that the composition \( V_{1,\text{tr}} \to G_{2,\text{sa}} \) is purely transcendental. In order to simplify notation, we write \( W \) for \( V_{1,\text{tr}} \) and \( G' \) for \( G_{2} \). We apply Theorem A.3 to \( W \to G'^{\text{sa}} \). Hence there is a decomposition \( W \cong W_{\text{tr}} \times W_{\text{alg}} \) such that the map is algebraic on \( W_{\text{alg}} \) and purely transcendental on \( W_{\text{tr}} \). The algebraic map \( W_{\text{alg}} \to G'^{\text{sa}} \) vanishes because \( W_{\text{alg}} \) is a vector group and \( G'^{\text{sa}} \) is semi-abelian. Hence we get an induced algebraic map \( W_{\text{alg}} \to V'_{\text{alg}} \) where \( V' \) is the vector part of \( G' \). This contradicts that \( W_{\text{an}} \to G_{\text{an}}^{\text{sa}} \) is purely transcendental. Hence \( W_{\text{alg}} \) is in fact 0 and \( W_{\text{an}} \to G'^{\text{sa,an}} \) is purely transcendental. \( \square \)
APPENDIX B

Generalised jacobians

Let $k$ be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. Let $Y$ be a smooth connected algebraic curve over $k$ with a chosen base point $y_0$.

The following theorem is a special case of the theory of generalised Jacobians. They were introduced by Rosenlicht. We follow the presentation of Serre, see [Ser88, Chapter V]. We recall briefly the deduction.

**Theorem B.1** (Rosenlicht, (see Serre [Ser88, Chapter V])). There is a semi-abelian variety $J(Y)$ over $k$ and a morphism

$$ Y \to J(Y) $$

depending only on $y_0$ such that $H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \to H_1(J(Y), \mathbb{Z})$ is an isomorphism.

**B.1. Construction of $J(Y)$**

Let $\bar{Y}$ be the smooth compactification closure of $Y$ and $S = \bar{Y} \setminus Y$ the set of points in the complement of $Y$. We define the divisor $m = \sum_{P \in S} P$. In the terminology of [Ser88] this is a (special case of a) modulus. The case $m = 0$ (i.e., $S = \emptyset$) is allowed.

A rational function $\varphi$ on $Y$ is congruent to 1 mod $m$ if $\nu_P(1 - \varphi) \geq 1$ for all $P \in S$ where $\nu_P$ denotes the valuation at $P$.

We denote

- $C_m$ the group of classes of divisors on $Y$ which are prime to $S$ modulo those which can be written as $(\varphi)$ for some rational function $\varphi \equiv 1 \mod m$;
- $J_m = C_m^0$ the subgroup of classes which have degree 0;
- $J = C^0$ is the usual group of divisor classes of degree 0.

Then there is a surjective homomorphism

$$ \pi : J_m \to J $$

with kernel $L_m$ consisting of those classes in $J_m$ of the form $\varphi$ which are invertible modulo $m$ at each $P \in S$. Moreover, let

$$ \theta : Y \to J_m $$

be the map assigning to a point $x \in Y$ the class of the divisor $x - y_0$.

By loc. cit. Chapter V Proposition 3, the group $J_m$ is an algebraic group. By loc. cit. Chapter V Proposition 4, the map $\theta$ is a morphism of algebraic varieties. The pair has a universal property for morphisms into commutative algebraic groups mapping $y_0$ to 0.
The structure of $J_m$ is explained in loc. cit. Chapter V Section §13. In the case $m = 0$, we get back the usual Jacobian of $\bar{C}$. This is an abelian variety. In our special case, the kernel $L_m$ has the form $G^r_m$ where we put

$$r = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } m = 0, \\ \deg m - 1 & \text{for } m \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

We put $J(Y) := J_m$. Hence we have the short exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow G^r_m \rightarrow J(Y) \rightarrow J(\bar{Y}) \rightarrow 0$$

and $J(Y)$ is semi-abelian.

### B.2. Generalised Jacobian over $\mathbb{C}$

The structure of $J_m$ over $\mathbb{C}$ is explained in loc. cit. Chapter V, §19. Serre shows

$$J_m(\mathbb{C}) \cong H^0(\bar{Y}, \Omega^1(-m))^\vee / H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}).$$

This implies that the map induced by $Y \rightarrow J(Y)$ induces an isomorphism

$$H_1(Y, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow H_1(J(Y)(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Z}).$$

**Remark B.2.** Actually, this isomorphism is shown in loc. cit. on the way to establishing the formula for $J_m(\mathbb{C})$.

The problem is also very interesting from a historical point of view. So far namely it was believed that transcendence theory developed in the nineteenth century with Liouville, Hermite and others. The document of Leibniz however shows that already in the seventeenth century the concept of transcendence of numbers was present.
APPENDIX C

Nori motives

We review a bare minimum of Nori’s theory of motive, to the extent needed in the main text. For a more complete picture, see [HMS17, Chapter 9.1].

We work over the base $k \subset \mathbb{C}$ and with $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients throughout. We denote by $\mathbb{Q} \text{-Vect}$ the category of finite dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-vector spaces and more generally by $E \text{-Mod}$ the category of finitely generated $E$-left modules for a finite dimensional $\mathbb{Q}$-algebra $E$.

C.1. Effective motives and realisations

A diagram $D$ is an oriented graph. A representation of $D$ is a map of oriented graphs $T : D \to \mathcal{A}$ into an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$. It assigns an object to every vertex and a morphism to every edge. There is an abstract construction due to Nori that attaches to every representation $T : D \to \mathbb{Q} \text{-Vect}$ a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear abelian category. It should be thought of as an abelian category generated by $D$ inside $\mathbb{Q} \text{-Vect}$. The category of motives is obtained for a particular choice of diagram and representation.

Definition C.1 ([HMS17, Definition 9.1.1]). Let $\text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$ be the following diagram:

1. the vertices are triples $(X, D, i)$ where $X$ is an algebraic variety over $k$, $D \subset X$ a closed subvariety and $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$;
2. there are two types of edges:
   - (functoriality) for every morphism of varieties $X \to X'$ mapping a subvariety $D \subset X$ to $D' \subset X'$ an edge $f^* : (X', D', i) \to (X, D, i)$;
   - (coboundary) for every triple $X \supset Y \supset Z$ an edge $\partial : (X, Y, i) \to (Y, Z, i + 1)$.

We define the singular realisation $H_{\text{sing}} : \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}} \to \mathbb{Q} \text{-Vect}$ by mapping vertices to singular cohomology $(X, D, i) \mapsto H^i_{\text{sing}}(X^\text{an}, D^\text{an}; \mathbb{Q})$ and edges of type $f^*$ to pull-back on cohomology and edges of type coboundary to the coboundary map in the long exact sequence in cohomology.
Theorem/Definition C.2 (Nori, [HMS17, Definition 9.1.3, Theorem 9.1.10]). There is an abelian $\mathbb{Q}$-linear category $\mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$, the category of effective Nori motives over $k$, a faithful exact functor

$$H_{\text{sing}} : \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathbb{Q}^{-\text{Vect}}$$

and a representation

$$H_{\text{Nori}} : \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}} \to \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$$

such that

$$H_{\text{sing}} \circ H_{\text{Nori}} = H_{\text{sing}},$$

in particular

$$H_{\text{sing}} \circ H_{\text{Nori}}(X, D, i) = H_{\text{sing}}(X, D, i) = H_{\text{sing}}^i(X, Y; \mathbb{Q}).$$

This data is uniquely determined by the following universal property:

Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear abelian category, $f : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{Q}^{-\text{Vect}}$ a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear faithful exact functor and $T : \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}} \to \mathcal{A}$ a representation such that

$$f \circ T \cong H_{\text{sing}}$$

Then $T$ extends canonically to $\mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$. More precisely, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear exact functor

$$\tilde{T} : \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{A}$$

and a natural isomorphism $f \circ \tilde{T} \to H^*$ extending the isomorphism on $\text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$.

The universal property can be summed up in a diagram:

In this very precise sense, $\mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$ is the abelian category generated by $\text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$.

We are also going to use the notation

$$H_{\text{Nori}}^i(X, D) = H_{\text{Nori}}(X, D, i)$$

and call it the $i$-th Nori motive of $(X, D)$.

For our purposes, the most important choices for $\mathcal{A}$ are the category $\text{MHS}_k$ of mixed $\mathbb{Q}$-Hodge structures over $k$, see Chapter IV and the category $(k, \mathbb{Q})^{-\text{Vect}}$, see also Chapter I. Deligne, see [Del74] constructed a functor $H^*_\text{Hdg} = (H^*_{\text{dR}}, H^*_{\text{sing}}, \phi)$ from the category of $k$-varieties to $\text{MHS}_k$. This has
been extended to the diagram $\text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$, see e.g. [Hub95] or as a by-product of [Hub00, Hub04]. We have a commutative diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{H_{\text{sing}}} & \mathbb{Q}\text{-Vect} \\
\downarrow H_{\text{Hdg}} & & \\
\mathbb{Q}\text{-Vect} & \xrightarrow{f} & MHS_k \\
\end{array}
\]

where $f$ is the forgetful functor $(V_{\text{dR}}, V_{\text{sing}}, \phi) \to V_{\text{sing}}$.

By the universal property, the representation extends to a functor on Nori motives:

\[
H_{\text{Hdg}} : \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \text{MHS}_k.
\]

We record:

**Definition C.3.** Let

\[
H_{\text{Hdg}} : \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \text{MHS}_k
\]

be the canonical extension of the representation of $\text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$ in $\text{MHS}_k$ compatible with the singular realisation. We call it the *Hodge realisation* of $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$.

By forgetting the filtrations (i.e., composing with the faithful exact functor $\text{MHS}_k \to (k, \mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$), we get the *period realisation*

\[
H : \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to (k, \mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}.
\]

By projecting to the $k$-component (i.e., composing with the faithful exact functor $(k, \mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect} \to k\text{-Vect}$), we get the *de Rham realisation*

\[
H_{\text{dR}} : \mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to k\text{-Vect}.
\]

**Remark C.4.**

1. Every effective Nori motive $M$ over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ has a well-defined set of periods, namely the periods of $H(M) \in (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$, namely the image of the period pairing

\[
H_{\text{dR}}(M) \times H_{\text{sing}}(M)^{\vee} \to \mathbb{C},
\]

see [HMS17, Section 11.2].

2. By the universal property, every object of $\mathcal{M}\mathcal{M}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$ is a sub-quotient of a motive of the form $H^i_{\text{Nori}}(X, D)$. This will allow us to reduce questions on periods of motives to motives of the special shape.

3. Note that we have set up the theory of motives to be *contravariant* on the category of varieties. This follows the convention of [HMS17], but differs from Nori’s original approach.
C.2. Filtration by degree

Following Ayoub and Barbieri-Viale in [ABV15] we concentrate on the subcategories generated by motives of bounded cohomological degree or dimension.

**Definition C.5.** For \( n \geq 0 \) let \( d_n \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) be the thick abelian subcategory (i.e., full closed under extensions and subquotients) generated by the objects \( H^i_{\text{Nori}}(X, D) \) with \( X \) a \( k \)-variety, \( D \subset X \) a closed subvariety and \( i \leq n \).

**Remark C.6.** Our definition is the contravariant analogue of [ABV15], Definition 3.1. By loc. cit. Proposition 3.2 it suffices to consider \( X \) of dimension at most \( n \). The period version of the argument for \( n = 1 \) is given in Proposition 6.5.

For \( n = 0 \), the category \( d_0 \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) is the category of Artin motives, see [ABV15] Theorem 4.3. It is the \( n = 1 \) case that is of direct relevance for us.

**Theorem C.7 (Ayoub, Barbieri-Viale [ABV15] Sections 5, 6)).**

1. The inclusion
   \[ d_1 \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \]
   has a left-adjoint.
2. There is an antiequivalence
   \[ 1-\text{Mot}_k \to d_1 \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}). \]
3. The abelian category \( d_1 \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \) can be described as the diagram category in the sense of Nori, see [HMS17] Theorem 7.1.13, defined by the diagram with vertices \((C, D)\) with \( C \) a smooth affine curve and \( D \) a collection of points on \( C \) and edges given by morphisms of pairs together with singular cohomology as a representation.

C.3. Non-effective motives

The full category of motives is constructed from the category of effective motives by inverting the Lefschetz motive

\[ \mathbb{Q}(-1) = H^2_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{P}^1) = H^*_{\text{Nori}}(\mathbb{G}_m, \{1\}). \]

We explain the construction.

**Remark C.8.** Nori constructs a tensor structure on the category \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \). However, the tensor category is not rigid. This is addressed by passing to \( \mathcal{M}_{\text{Nori}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \), which turns out to be rigid. We do not need the tensor structure, so we do not go into details, instead see [HMS17] Section 9.3.
The map of diagrams
\[ \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}} \to \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}} \]
given by
\[(X, D, i) \mapsto (X \times \mathbb{G}_m, X \times \{1\} \sqcup D \times \mathbb{G}_m, i + 1)\]
is compatible with singular realisation because
\[ H^{i+1}_\text{sing}(X \times \mathbb{G}_m, X \times \{1\} \sqcup D \times \mathbb{G}_m; \mathbb{Q}) \]
\[ \cong H^i_\text{sing}(X, D; \mathbb{Q}) \otimes H^1(\mathbb{G}_m, \{1\}; \mathbb{Q}) = H^i_\text{sing}(X, D; \mathbb{Q}). \]
Note that this stupid version of the Knoneth formula actually holds true because the whole cohomology of \((\mathbb{G}_m, \{1\})\) is concentrated in degree 1. It is what Nori calls a \textit{good pair}.

By the universal property of the category of effective Nori motives, this induces a faithful exact functor
\[ (-1) : \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}). \]

\textbf{Definition C.9.} The category of \textit{Nori motives} \(\mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})\) over \(k\) with coefficients in \(\mathbb{Q}\) is defined as the localisation of \(\mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q})\) with respect to the twist functor \((-1)\), i.e., \((-1)\) induces an equivalence of categories
\[ (-1) : \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}). \]

See [HMS17, Section 8.2] for a construction of the same localisation in terms of diagrams. By construction, the natural functor
\[ \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \]
is faithful. However, we do not know if it is full.

\textbf{Remark C.10.} It is also an open question whether the inclusion
\[ d_1 : \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}^{\text{eff}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \to \mathcal{M}_\text{Nori}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \]
into the category of all motives is full. We give a positive answer for \(k = \overline{\mathbb{Q}}\) in Theorem \[7.4\]

\textbf{C.4. The subcategory generated by a single object}

We specialise Nori’s result to a category generated by a single object. Actually, this is a main step for the proof in the general case. We say that abelian category \(\mathcal{A}\) is generated by an object \(M\), if the smallest full subcategory closed under subquotients and containing \(M\) agrees with \(\mathcal{A}\). This is equivalent to saying that all objects of \(\mathcal{A}\) are subquotients of \(M^n\) for \(n \geq 1\). We write \(\mathcal{A} = \langle M \rangle\).
**Definition C.11.** Let $\mathcal{A} = \{M\}$ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-linear abelian category generated by a single object. Let $T : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{Q}^{-}\text{Vect}$ be a faithful exact functor. We introduce the *endomorphism algebra*\
\[
\text{End}(T) = \left\{ (\phi_N) \in \prod_{N \in \{M\}} \text{End}_\mathbb{Q}(T(N)) \mid \phi_N \circ f = f \circ \phi_N \forall f : N \to N' \right\}
\]
of $T$.

By [HMS17, Corollary 7.3.19] this is the subalgebra of $\text{End}_\mathbb{Q}(V_{\text{sing}}(M))$ of endomorphisms respecting all subquotients of all $M^n$. In particular, it is finite dimensional over $\mathbb{Q}$.

We are particularly interested in the case $\langle M \rangle \subset 1^{-}\text{Mot}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ and $T = V_{\text{sing}}$. In this case, we write by abuse of notation
\[
E(M) = \text{End}(V_{\text{sing}}(\langle M \rangle)) \subset \text{End}(V_{\text{sing}}(M)).
\]

**Proposition C.12** ([HMS17, Theorem 7.3.19]). The category $\langle M \rangle$ is equivalent to the category of finitely generated $\text{End}(T)$-modules.

**C.5. The period conjecture**

We formulate an abstract version of Kontsevich’s period conjecture. In the main text we establish its validity for certain cases.

**Definition C.13.** Let $D$ be a diagram and $T : D \to (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})^{-}\text{Vect}$ a representation. We write $T_{\text{dr}}$ and $T_{\text{sing}}$ for the projection to the $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$- and $\mathbb{Q}$-component respectively. The space of *formal periods of $D$* is defined as
\[
\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(D) = \left( \bigoplus_{N \in D} T_{\text{dr}}(N) \otimes_\mathbb{Q} T_{\text{sing}}(N)^\vee \right) / \text{functoriality}
\]
i.e., the quotient by the relations of the form
\[
(f_* \omega) \otimes \sigma - \omega \otimes f^* \sigma
\]
for all edges $f : N \to N'$, $\omega \in T_{\text{dr}}(N)$, $\sigma \in T_{\text{sing}}(N')$.

Formal periods can be evaluated to actual periods, i.e., numbers in $\mathbb{C}$, via the period isomorphism. In other words, there is a bilinear map
\[
T_{\text{dr}}(N) \times T_{\text{sing}}(N)^\vee \to \mathbb{C}
\]
\[
(a, b) \mapsto b_{\mathbb{C}}(\phi(a)_{\mathbb{C}})
\]

**Definition C.14.** The space $\mathcal{P}(D)$ of *periods of $D$* is defined as the image of $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(D)$ under the evaluation map $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(D) \to \mathbb{C}$.

We say that the period conjecture holds for $(D, T)$ if the surjective map
\[
\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(D) \to \mathcal{P}(D)
\]
is injective.
In other words: all relations between the periods of $D$ with respect to $T$ are induced from bilinearity and the obvious relation defined by the edges of $D$.

**Remark C.15.** If $D = \text{Pairs}^{\text{eff}}$, then this is (nearly) the original conjecture of Kontsevich. The relations are the obvious relations of periods:

1. If $N = H^i(X, D)$, $N' = H^i(X', D')$ and $f = g^*$ for $g : X' \to X$ with $g(D') \subset D$, then the relation corresponds to the transformation formula for integrals.

2. If $N = H^i(X, Y)$, $N' = H^{i+1}(Y, Z)$ for $Z \subset Y \subset X$ and $f = \partial : H^i(X, Y) \to H^{i+1}(Y, Z)$ the boundary morphism, then the relation corresponds to Stokes’s formula.

For a complete discussion of this period conjecture and how it relates to other conjectures in the literature, see [Hub18]. For a full proof of these compatibilities, see [HMS17, Chapter 13]. In particular, the period conjecture holds for $(D, T)$ if and only if it holds for its diagram category attached to $D$ and $T$. If $D = \mathcal{A}$ is an abelian category and $T$ an exact faithful functor, then the period conjecture holds for $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if it holds for all full subcategories closed under subquotients of the form $(M)$. We write $\tilde{P}(M)$ and $P(M)$ in this case.

**Lemma C.16.**

1. $\tilde{P}(M)$ is a quotient of $T_{\text{dR}}(M) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} T_{\text{sing}}(M)^{\vee}$, in particular it has a finite dimension over $\mathbb{Q}$.

2. The space of formal periods has an alternative description as

$$\tilde{P}(M) = \left\{ (\phi_N) \in \prod_{N \in (M)} \text{Hom}_{\text{Q}}(T_{\text{dR}}(N), T_{\text{sing}}(N)_{\text{Q}}) \mid \phi_{N'} \circ f = f \circ \phi_N \forall f : N \to N' \right\}^{\vee}.$$

3. The $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$-dual of $\tilde{P}(M)$ is a right $\text{End}(M)$-module. Moreover, the data of $(k, \mathbb{Q})$-Vect induces an isomorphism

$$E(M)_C \to \tilde{P}(M)^{\vee}_C,$$

in particular

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} E(M) = \dim_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \tilde{P}(M).$$

In the language of [Hub18, Definition 4.1], $\tilde{P}$ is a semi-torsor under the coalgebra $E(M)^{\vee}$. We give the uncomplicated proof again.

**Proof.** The first assertion is the analogue of the dual of the inclusion (16).

We explain the argument this time: if $f : N \to N'$ is surjective, then all generators defined on $N'$ are identified with generators on $N$ because $T_{\text{dR}}(N) \to T_{\text{dR}}(N')$ is surjective. Every element has the form $f_\ast \omega$ for $\omega \in T_{\text{dR}}(N)$. In the same way, if $f : N \to N'$ is injective, then the generators on $N$ are identified with generators on $N'$. By assumption, every object of $(M)$ is a subobject of some $M^n$ for $n \geq 1$. Hence it suffices to consider
generators on $M^n$. The injections $i_1, \ldots, i_n : M \to M^n$ and the projections $p_1, \ldots, p_n : M^n \to M$ induce identifications of the formal periods of $M^n$ with sums of formal periods of $M$.

For the second statement note that

$$T_{\text{dR}}(N) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} T_{\text{sing}}(N) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}}(T_{\text{dR}}(N), T_{\text{sing}}(N)_{\mathbb{Q}}).$$

The operation of $E(M)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ on $\tilde{P}(M)_{\mathbb{Q}}$ is by composition.

After extension of scalars to $\mathbb{C}$, the period isomorphism $\phi : T_{\text{dR}}(N)_{\mathbb{C}} \to T_{\text{sing}}(N)_{\mathbb{C}}$ that is part of the data of $T(N) = (T_{\text{dR}}(N), T_{\text{sing}}(N), \phi) \in (\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Q})$-Vect induces the isomorphism

$$E(M)_{\mathbb{C}} \cong \tilde{P}(M)_{\mathbb{C}}.$$

The statement on dimensions is obvious from that. \hfill $\Box$

**Corollary C.17.** The period conjecture holds for $\langle M \rangle$ if and only if

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} P(M) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} E(M).$$

**Proof.** The surjective linear map of finite dimensional vector spaces $\tilde{P}(M) \to P(M)$ is injective if and only if they have the same dimension. Then apply Lemma [C.16] \hfill $\Box$

**Remark C.18.** We are mostly interested in the case $A \subset 1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$.

The first main result of the present paper is the proof of the period conjecture for $A = 1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$, see Theorem 3.8. The consequence for of $A = \langle M \rangle \subset 1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is addressed in Corollary 3.10. In order to be compatible with the normalisations in Definition 3.1, we have to use

$$T : 1-\text{Mot}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}} \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow (V_{\text{dR}}(M), V_{\text{sing}}(M))} (\overline{\mathbb{Q}}, \mathbb{Q})$$.Vect."

The translation to Nori motives is Theorem 7.3.
In this appendix, we identify Deligne’s explicit realisations of 1-motives with realisations of motives of algebraic varieties.

We work over an algebraically closed field $k$ with a fixed embedding into $\mathbb{C}$. Recall the functor

$$V : 1\text{-Mot}_{k} \to \text{MHS}_{k} \to (k,\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}.$$ 

It maps the iso-1-motive $M = [\mathbb{L} \to G]$ to the triple consisting of its singular realisation $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$, its de Rham realisation $V_{\text{dR}}(M)$ and the period isomorphism. We refer to Chapter 2 for their construction.

On the other hand, every morphism $Y \to X$ of smooth $k$-varieties gives rise to an object $M(Y \to X) \in \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k)$. Let $H^{0} : \text{DM}_{\text{gm}}(k) \to (k,\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}$ be the standard cohomological functor of [Hub00, Hub04] and $H^{1} = H^{0} \circ [1]$. By composition we define

$$H^{1}(Y \to X) \in (k,\mathbb{Q})\text{-Vect}.$$ 

Its de Rham component is defined explicitly as $H^{1}$ of

$$R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X,Y) := \text{Cone}(R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(Y) \to R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X))[-1]$$
and its singular component as $H^{1}$ of

$$R\Gamma_{\text{sing}}(X,Y) := \text{Cone}(R\Gamma_{\text{sing}}(Y) \to R\Gamma_{\text{sing}}(X))[-1]$$
where $R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}$ and $R\Gamma_{\text{sing}}$ are functorial complexes computing de Rham and singular cohomology respectively, see [HMS17, Section 3.3.3, Section 5.5]. They are connected by a period isomorphism, see loc.cit. Corollary 5.52. In the special case $Y \subset X$, we get back relative cohomology as considered in Chapter 6.

### D.1. The de Rham realisation

We review the definition of the de Rham realisation in the smooth case. It is given as the hypercohomology of the complex of algebraic differentials.

We make this explicit and relate it to the general $R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}$. Let $X$ be a smooth variety, $\mathcal{U} = (U_{1},\ldots,U_{n})$ an open cover of $X$ by affine subvarieties $U_{i}$. For ever $I \subset \{1,\ldots,n\}$ we put $U_{I} = \bigcap_{i \in I} U_{i}$. For every $p,q \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ we put

$$C^{p}(\mathcal{U},\Omega^{q}_{X}) = \prod_{|I| = p+1} \Omega^{q}(U_{I}).$$
They form a double complex. The differential in \( q \)-direction is induced by the differential of \( \Omega_X^* \). The differential in \( p \)-direction is the differential of the Čech-complex: for \( \alpha = (\alpha_I) \in C^p(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_X^q) \) we have

\[
\delta^p(\alpha)_{i_0 \leq i_1 \leq i_p} = \sum_{j=0}^{p} (-1)^j \alpha_{i_0 \leq i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_p - \hat{i}_j \leq \ldots \leq i_p}
\]

where \( \hat{i}_j \) means that the index is omitted.

**Definition D.1.** Let \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X, \mathcal{U}) \) be the total complex of the double complex \( C^p(\mathcal{U}, \Omega_X^q) \).

**Remark D.2.** This complex is nice because it is explicit and bounded. Note, however, that the boundary depends on the choice of an ordering of \( U_1, \ldots, U_n \). In consequence, these complexes have bad functorial properties, unless \( f : Y \to X \) is affine.

**Lemma D.3.** Let \( X \) be a smooth variety, \( \mathcal{U} \) a finite open affine cover of \( X \). Then there is a natural isomorphism of complexes in the derived category

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X, \mathcal{U}) \to R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X)
\]

functorial for affine maps. If \( Y \subset X \) is a smooth closed subvariety, then

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X, Y, \mathcal{U}) := \text{Cone}(R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(Y, \mathcal{U} \cap Y) \to R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X, \mathcal{U}))[−1]
\]

is naturally isomorphic to \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X, Y) \).

**Proof.** The definition of \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}} \) for complexes of smooth varieties is given in [HMS17, Definition 3.3.1]. For a single smooth variety it is by loc. cit. Definition 3.3.14 given as global sections of the Godement resolution (see loc. cit. Section 1.4.2)

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X) = Gd_X \Omega_X^*(X).
\]

The Čech-complex

\[
\text{tot}(C^*(\mathcal{U}, Gd_X \Omega_X^*))
\]

receives natural quasi-isomorphisms both from \( R\Gamma(X, \mathcal{U}) \) (because the natural map \( \Omega_X^* \to Gd_X \Omega_X^* \) is quasi-isomorphism of complexes of sheaves) and from \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X) \) (because the cover \( \mathcal{U} \) refines \( X \)). Together they define an isomorphism in the derived category.

The construction extends to complexes \( Y \to X \). \( \square \)

If \( \dim X = 0 \), then actually \( \Omega_X^* = \mathcal{O}_X[0] \) and the Godement resolution is trivial, hence

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(X) = \mathcal{O}_X(X).
\]

We now spell out the curve case in degree 1. Let \( C \) be a smooth affine curve over \( k \), \( D \subset C \) a finite set of closed points, viewed a smooth subvariety of dimension 0. We use the trivial cover \( \mathcal{U} = (C) \) and get

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(C, \mathcal{U}) = [\mathcal{O}(C) \xrightarrow{f \mapsto (df(−f[D]))} \Omega^1(C) \oplus \mathcal{O}(D)]
\]
with $\mathcal{O}(C)$ in degree 0.

More generally, if $C$ is not necessarily affine, let $U_1, \ldots, U_n$ be an open affine cover. We write $D_i = U_i \cap D$ and more generally $D_I = D \cap U_I$. By definition $R\Gamma(C, D, \mathcal{U})$ is the shifted cone of

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\prod_{i<j} \Omega^1(U_i \cap U_j) \oplus \prod_{|I|=3} \mathcal{O}(U_I) \longrightarrow \prod_{|I|=3} \mathcal{O}(D_I) \\
\prod_{i=1} \Omega^1(U_i) \oplus \prod_{i<j} \mathcal{O}(U_i \cap U_j) \longrightarrow \prod_{i<j} \mathcal{O}(D_i \cap D_j) \\
\prod_{i=1} \mathcal{O}(U_i) \longrightarrow \prod_{i=1} \mathcal{O}(D_i)
\end{array}
\]

**Lemma D.4.** The group $H^1_{\text{dR}}(C, D)$ is given by the cohomology in degree 1 of

\[
\prod_{i=1} \mathcal{O}(U_i) \rightarrow \left( \prod_{i=1} \Omega^1(U_i) \oplus \prod_{i<j} \mathcal{O}(U_i \cap U_j) \oplus \prod_{i=1} \mathcal{O}(D_i) \right) \\
\rightarrow \left( \prod_{i<j} \Omega^1(U_i \cap U_j) \oplus \prod_{|I|=3} \mathcal{O}(U_I) \oplus \prod_{i<j} \mathcal{O}(D_i \cap D_j) \right) \rightarrow \ldots
\]

with differentials

\[
d^0((f_i)_i) = ((df_i)_i, (f_j - f_i)_{ij}, (-f_i|D_i)_i) \\
d^1((\omega_i)_i, (f_{ij})_{ij}, (g_i)_i) = ((-\omega_j + \omega_i + df_{ij})_{ij}, (-f_{i1} + f_{i0} - f_{i0i1})_{i0i1i2}, (-f_{ij}|D_{ij} - g_j + g_i)_{ij})
\]

**Remark D.5.** The signs in these differentials depend on the sign conventions used for total complexes, shift and cones. We are using the normalisations of [HMS17, Section 1.3]. Note, however, that any other choice of sign conventions will lead to isomorphic cohomology groups. We only have ensure that $d^1 \circ d^0 = 0$.

**D.2. The comparison result**

**Proposition D.6.** Let $M = [L \xrightarrow{f} G]$ be a 1-motive. Let $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ be a basis of $L$ and put $e_0 = 0$. We put $Z = \coprod_{i=0}^r \text{Spec}(k) = \{P_0, \ldots, P_r\}$ and $f : Z \to G$ given by $\bar{f}(P_i) = f(e_i)$. Then

\[
V(M)^\vee \cong H^1(Z \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} G).
\]
The proof will take the rest of the appendix. Before going into it, we want to record a consequence. Let $M = [L \to G]$ be a 1-motive. The assignment

$$S \mapsto [L \otimes \mathbb{Q} \to G(S) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}]$$

defines a complex of homotopy invariant Nisnevich sheaves with transfers on the category $\text{Sm}/k$ of smooth $k$-varieties, see [AEWH15, Lemma 2.1.2] building on work of Spieß-Szamuely and Orgogozo. Hence it defines an object of the full subcategory $\text{DM}_{gm}(k, \mathbb{Q})$, see [AEWH15, Proposition 5.2.1]. We denote it $M_{gm}(L \to G)$.

**Corollary D.7.** Let $M = [L \to G]$ be a 1-motive over $k$. Then

$$V(M) \cong H^0(M_{gm}(L \to G)) = H^0(M_{gm}(L \to G)).$$

**Proof.** The equality on the right is [AEWH15, Proposition 7.2.3]. In order to compare $V(M)$ and $H^0(M_{gm}(L \to G))$ it suffices to give a natural isomorphism

$$H^0(M_{gm}(L \to G)) \to H^1(G, Z)$$

with $Z$ as in Proposition D.6. The main result of [AEWH15] is to describe $G$ as a direct summand of $M_{gm}(G)$. Its cohomology in any contravariant Weil cohomology theory (e.g. de Rham or singular cohomology) agrees with $H^1(G)$. In particular,

$$H^*(M_{gm}(L \to G)) = H^1(G).$$

The projection map $M_{gm}(G) \to G$ is given by the summation map

$$M_{gm}(G)(S) = \text{Cor}(S, G) \to G(S).$$

On the other hand, $L = M_{gm}(Z')$ with $Z' = \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$. There is a natural projection $M_{gm}(Z) \to M_{gm}(Z')$.

Our comparison isomorphism is induced by the morphism of motivic complexes

$$[M_{gm}(Z) \to M_{gm}(G)] \to [M_{gm}(Z') \to G].$$

We apply the long exact cohomology sequence for the stupid filtration:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
H^0(G) \to H^0(Z) \to H^1(G, Z) \to H^1(G) \to 0 \\
\ uparrow & \uparrow & \uparrow \\
0 \to H^0(Z') \to H^0(M_{gm}(L \to G)) \to H^1(G) \to 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

The vertical map on the left induces an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{Q}^r \cong H^0(Z') \to H^0(Z)/H^0(G) = \mathbb{Q}^{r+1}/\Delta(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Together with the identity on the right this induces an isomorphism in the middle. $\square$

We now start on the proof of Proposition D.6.
**Lemma D.8.** Let \( M = [L \to G] \in \text{1-Mot}_k \) and \( Z \to G \) as in Proposition D.6. Then

\[
V_{\text{dR}}(M)^\vee \cong H_{\text{dR}}^1(Z \to G).
\]

**Proof.** We refer to Chapter 2 for the construction of the algebraic group \( M^\diamond \to G \) and the realisations. Note that \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(Z) = H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z) \cong k^{r+1} \) because \( Z \) is of dimension zero. Hence

\[
R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(G, Z)^i = \begin{cases} R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(G)^i & i \neq 1 \\ R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(G)^1 \oplus H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z) & i = 1 \end{cases}
\]

We claim that there is a natural map in the derived category

\[
V_{\text{dR}}(M)^\vee[-1] = \text{coLie}(M^h)[-1] \to R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(G, Z).
\]

It is induced by the composition

\[
\text{coLie}(M^h) \to \Omega^1(M^h) \to R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(M^h)^1 \leftarrow R\Gamma_{\text{dR}}(G)^1
\]

where the maps are

- extending an element of the cotangent space to a unique equivariant differential form (it is closed because the co-Lie bracket is trivial);
- mapping sections of the de Rham complex to sections of its Godement resolution;
- naturality of \( R\Gamma_{\text{dR}} \) (it is a quasi-isomorphism by homotopy invariance)

together with the map

\[
\text{coLie}(M^h) \to H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z).
\]

We compare the long exact sequence of the cone with the exact sequence for \( V_{\text{dR}}(M) \):

\[
0 \to H^0_{\text{dR}}(G) \to H^0_{\text{dR}}(Z) \to H^1_{\text{dR}}(G, Z) \to H^1_{\text{dR}}(G) \to 0
\]

The square on the right commutes by naturality. The dotted arrow does not exist as a natural map, but we get an induced map

\[
\text{Hom}(L, \mathbb{G}_a) \to H^0_{\text{dR}}(Z)/H^0_{\text{dR}}(G).
\]

We make it explicit. Pick \( \alpha : L \to \mathbb{G}_a \). It defines a differential form \( \omega(\alpha) \) on the algebraic group \( V = \mathbb{G}_a(\text{Hom}(L, \mathbb{G}_a)^\vee) \). In coordinates: let \( t_i \) be the coordinate on \( V \) corresponding to the basis vector \( e_i \) of \( L \). Then

\[
\omega(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha(e_i) dt_i.
\]

We have an exact sequence

\[
0 \to \mathbb{G}_a \to M^h \to V \to 0,
\]
hence we can pull \( \omega(\alpha) \) back to \( M^1 \). This defines a class in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(G, Z) \). Its image in \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(G) \) vanishes by construction. This implies that the class is exact. Indeed,

\[
\omega(\alpha) = d \left( \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha(e_i)t_i + c \right)
\]

for any \( c \in k \). We lift \( Z \to G \) to \( Z \to M^3 \) by mapping \( P_i \) to the image of \( e_i \) in \( M^3 \). We get a class in \( H^0_{\text{dR}}(Z) = H^0(Z, \mathcal{O}_Z) \) by restricting our function \( \sum_i \alpha(e_i)t_i + c \) to \( Z \):

\[
P_i \mapsto \alpha(e_i) + c.
\]

(Note that \( \alpha(e_0) = \alpha(0) = 0 \).) The equivalence class in \( H^0_{\text{dR}}(Z)/H^0_{\text{dR}}(G) \) is independent of \( c \) and hence well-defined.

Now that we have an explicit formula, it is obvious that the map is bijective. Hence it remains to show that coLie\((G^3) \to H^1_{\text{dR}}(G)\) is an isomorphism.

Both coLie and \( H^1_{\text{dR}} \) are exact functors on the category of semi-abelian varieties, hence it suffices to consider the cases \( G = G_m \) and \( G = A \) abelian. In the first case, \( G_m^\# = G_m \) and the invariant differential \( dt/t \) is known to generate \( H^1_{\text{dR}}(G_m) \).

Let \( G = A \) be an abelian variety. In this case \( \Omega^1(A) = \Omega^1(A)^A \cong \text{coLie}(A) \). By Hodge theory, we have the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to \Omega^1(A) \to H^1_{\text{dR}}(A) \to H^1(A, \mathcal{O}_A) \to 0.
\]

The last group also identifies with \( \text{Ext}^1(A, G_a) \). The exact sequence is compatible with the sequence

\[
0 \to \text{coLie}(A) \to \text{coLie}(A^3) \to \text{Ext}^1(A, G_a) \to 0.
\]

Hence \( \text{coLie}(A^3) \to H^1_{\text{dR}}(A) \) is an isomorphism as well. \( \square \)

**Lemma D.9.** Let \( M = [L \to G] \in 1-\text{Mot}_k \) and \( Z \to G \) as in Proposition [D.6]. Then

\[
V_{\text{sing}}(M)^\vee \cong H^1_{\text{sing}}(Z \to G).
\]

**Proof.** It is more natural to give the argument in terms of homology. We use the description via \( C^\infty \)-chains, see [HMS17, Definition 2.2.2]. We work with integral coefficients throughout and omit them from the notation.

Recall that by construction \( f : L \to G \) has an injective lift \( f^\#: L \to M^3 \). By abuse of notation the map \( P_i \mapsto f^\#(e_i) \) is also denoted \( \tilde{f} : Z \to M^3 \). By homotopy invariance \( H^1_{\text{sing}}(Z \to G) \cong H^1_{\text{sing}}(Z \to M^3) \). From now on we work with the latter.

For every algebraic variety \( X/k \) let \( S^\infty_*^\sim(X) \) be the chain complex of \( C^\infty \)-chains on \( X^{\text{an}} \) with integral coefficients. For a morphism \( f : Y \to X \), we then define \( H^i_{\text{sing}}(\bar{X}, X) \) as \( H_i \) of the complex

\[
S^\infty_*^\sim(X, Y) := \text{Cone}(S^\infty_*^\sim(Y) \to S^\infty_*^\sim(X)).
\]
As $Z$ is a disjoint union of points, $S^\infty_0(Z) = \mathbb{Z}[Z]$ (linear combinations of points) for all $n \geq 0$ and the map of complexes
\[ S^\infty_0(Z) \to \mathbb{Z}[Z][0] \]
is a quasi-isomorphism. We define a map of complexes
\[ S^\infty_0(M^\h) \to [\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}] \]
as follows:
- in degree 1 a path $\gamma : [0,1] \to M^{\h,an}$ is mapped to $I(\gamma) \in \text{Lie}(M^{\h,an})$ (see Section 1.2);
- in degree 0 a formal sum in $\mathbb{Z}[M^{\h,an}]$ is mapped to its sum in $M^{\h,an}$.
This is compatible with the differential because $\exp(I(\gamma)) = \gamma(1) - \gamma(0)$. It is easy to see that the diagram of complexes
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
S^\infty_0(Z) & \longrightarrow & S^\infty_0(M^\h) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
L[0] & \longrightarrow & [\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}]
\end{array}
\]
commutes. Hence we get morphisms of complexes
\[ S^\infty_0(M^\h, Z) \to \text{Cone}(L[0] \to [\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}]) 
= [L \oplus \text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}] \to [\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}/f^\h(L)]. \]
By definition
\[ T_{\text{sing}}(M) = \ker(\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}/f^\h(L)) \]
hence we have defined a natural morphism in the derived category
\[ S^\infty_0(M^\h, Z) \to T_{\text{sing}}(M)[-1]. \]

We compare the long exact sequence of the cone with the exact sequence for $V_{\text{sing}}(M)$:
\[
\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & H^\text{sing}_1(M^\h) & \longrightarrow & H^\text{sing}_1(Z \to M^\h) & \longrightarrow & H^\text{sing}_0(Z) & \longrightarrow & H^\text{sing}_0(M^\h) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_{\text{sing}}(G) & \longrightarrow & T_{\text{sing}}(M) & \longrightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}
\]
We make the dotted maps explicit. The elements of $H^\text{sing}_i(M^\h)$ are represented by closed loops in $M^{\h,an}$. Let $\gamma$ be such a closed loop. Then the end points of $\tilde{\gamma}$ have the same image in $M^{\h,an}$, hence $\tilde{\gamma}(1) - \tilde{\gamma}(0) \in \ker(\text{Lie}(M^{\h,an}) \to M^{\h,an}) = T_{\text{sing}}(G)$. The dotted map on the left is an isomorphism.

The kernel of $H^\text{sing}_0(Z) \to H^\text{sing}_0(G)$ is generated by formal differences $P_1 - P_0$. Choose a path $\gamma_i$ from $\tilde{f}(P_0) = 0$ to $\tilde{f}(P_i)$ in $M^{\h,an}$. Then
\[ (-\gamma_i, P_1 - P_0) \in S^\infty_1(M^\h, Z) \]
is in the kernel of boundary map. Hence its cohomology class is the preimage of $P_i - P_0$. Its image in $\text{Lie}(M^{\text{an}})$ is given by $\tilde{\gamma}_i(0) - \tilde{\gamma}_i(1)$ for a lift $\tilde{\gamma}_i$ of $\gamma_i$. We may choose $\tilde{\gamma}_i(0) = 0$, then $-\tilde{\gamma}_i(1)$ is in the preimage of $\tilde{f}(P_i)$. (Which preimage depends on the choice of $\gamma_i$. It is only unique up to 2-chains.) Its equivalence class modulo $T_{\text{sing}}(G)$ is nothing but the image in $M^{\text{an}}$, hence $\tilde{f}(P_i) = f^h(e_i)$. The map $\ker(H_0(Z) \to H_0(M^h)) \to L$ is also bijective.

This finishes the proof. □

**Lemma D.10.** The comparison maps for de Rham and singular cohomology are compatible with the period isomorphism.

**Proof.** In keeping with the proof of the last lemma, we prefer to check compatibility with the period pairing:

$$H^1_{\text{dR}}(G, Z) \times H^1_{\text{sing}}(G, Z) \to \mathbb{C}$$

A priori, the pairing on the 1-motive level is simply evaluation of an element of $\text{coLie}(M^h)$ on $\sigma \in \text{Lie}(M)_C$. However, we have already made the translation to the integration of equivariant differential forms on $M^{\text{an}}$ along paths.

We now view the same differential form as a class in de Rham cohomology and the path as a class in singular homology. The cohomological version of the period pairing is also given by integration in these special cases. □

**Proof of Proposition D.6.** Put together the Lemmas D.8, D.9 and D.10. □
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