arXiv:0711.3918v2 [math.AG] 5 Dec 2007

Artin's Vanishing for torsion motivic homology; numerical motives form a tannakian category!

M.V. Bondarko *

February 5, 2014

Abstract

We prove a certain Artin's vanishing theorem for torsion motivic cohomology with compact support of a smooth affine (*embedded*) variety and also a certain Weak Lefschetz theorem for torsion motivic cohomology. In characteristic zero we also have a similar Weak Lefschetz statement for algebraic cycles modulo algebraic equivalence groups (with rational coefficients).

These motivic cohomology computations yield that in the category DM_{gm}^{eff} of Voevodsky's motives there is a large (generating) collection OM of *obvious* motives such that: there are no non-divisible negative degree morphisms between motives in OM and degree zero morphisms are controlled by étale cohomology (modulo divisible morphisms). It follows that all objects of OM become evenly finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura in the category of complexes of homological motives. Therefore the motivic zeta-function of the homological motif of a smooth projective variety is rational and also satisfies certain functional equation.

Since the category of (rational) numerical motives is semisimple, we easily obtain that all numerical motives are Kimura-finite. This immediately implies that $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ is (essentially) Tannakian.

We deduce that the Sign Conjecture (for homological motives) implies the Standard Kunneth Conjecture.

Over a finite field we prove that the action of Frobenius on any motif is finite-dimensional (modulo divisible morphisms); hence one

*The author gratefully acknowledges the support from Deligne 2004 Balzan prize in mathematics. The work is also supported by RFBR (grant no. 08-01-00777a) and INTAS (grant no. 05-1000008-8118).

can lift the Kunneth decomposition of the diagonal "modulo divisible morphisms". We also bound the exponents of the Quillen K_i-groups of $V \in SmPrVar$ with torsion coefficients for $i > 1$.

MSC 2000: 14F42; 14F20; 19D55.

Keywords: motives, motivic and étale cohomology, algebraic cycles, finite-dimensional motives, motivic zeta-functions.

Contents

1 Motives; motivic and étale cohomology: reminder **7**
- 1.1 On Voevodsky's motives 7
- 1.2 Motivic vs. étale cohomology: reminder 10

2 Artin's vanishing for torsion motivic homology **11**
- 2.1 Some étale cohomology computations: a generalization of a theorem of Arapura and Sastry 12
- 2.2 The expression of motivic cohomology of certain motives in terms of certain étale cohomology 14
- 2.3 The case when étale cohomology majorates the motivic one . . 17
- 2.4 Corollaries: Artin's vanishing and Weak Lefschetz for torsion motivic cohomology 18
- 2.5 On algebraic classes in cohomology 21
- 2.6 Weak Lefschetz for cycles modulo algebraic equivalence for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ 22

3 Obvious motives and their morphisms **24**
- 3.1 Some computations; the weight complex functor 24
- 3.2 The definition of *positive*, *negative*, and *obvious* Voevodsky motives 25
- 3.3 Divisible groups and phantom motives 29
- 3.4 The study of morphisms between classes of motives described 31

4 All numerical motives are finite-dimensional; divisible motivic zeta functions are rational **32**
- 4.1 Obvious motives and their weight complexes of are (divisibly) finite-dimensional 32
- 4.2 Numerical motives are Kimura-finite 35
- 4.3 Towards the proof of the Standard Kunneth Conjecture 36
- 4.4 Divisible and homological motivic zeta functions of (smooth projective) varieties are rational 39

5 The case of finite K **41**
5.1 The action of Frobenius on any motif is divisibly finite-dimensional 42
5.2 Bounding the exponents of certain motivic cohomology groups 43

Introduction

We prove that the $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-motivic cohomology with compact support of a smooth affine variety of dimension m injects into its $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-étale cohomology (with compact support) in dimensions $\leq m$; so it's zero in dimensions $< m$. The proof of this fact is based on the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum Conjecture. The latter allows to express motivic cohomology of (some) motives in terms of étale cohomology of certain "limits of motives". Along with a certain "singular" version of the Weak Lefschetz theorem for étale cohomology (related to those proved in [3]) this allows us to prove the comparison result required.

We easily deduce a certain Artin's vanishing theorem for torsion motivic cohomology of smooth affine (*embedded*) variety with compact support and also a certain Weak Lefschetz theorem for torsion motivic cohomology. We also prove that algebraic classes of small codimension (in cohomology) could be "lifted" from those of hyperplane sections. Therefore it suffices to prove the Hodge and Tate conjectures for $H^{2n}(P)$ of all smooth projective P of dimension $2n$.

Using a result of Bloch and Ogus (instead of the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum conjecture), for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ we also prove a similar Weak Lefschetz-type statement for algebraic cycles modulo algebraic equivalence groups (with rational coefficients).

These motivic cohomology computations yield that in the category DM_{gm}^{eff} of Voevodsky's motives there is a large (generating) collection OM of *obvious* motives such that there are no non-divisible negative degree morphisms between motives in OM and degree zero morphisms are controlled by étale cohomology modulo divisible morphisms. This yields that all objects of OM become evenly finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura in the category of complexes of homological motives. It easily follows that the motivic zeta-function of the homological motif of a smooth projective variety is rational and also satisfies certain functional equation.

Since the category of (rational) numerical motives is semisimple, we easily obtain that all numerical motives are Kimura-finite. By well-known results, this immediately implies that $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ is (essentially) Tannakian. This fact along with the properties of obvious motives allows us to propose a possible approach to the proof of the Standard Kunneth Conjecture. In particular,

the Sign Conjecture (for homological motives) implies the Standard Kunneth Conjecture.

Following C. Mazza, we could have considered the notion of a *Schur-finite* motif. Then our result would yield that Chow (and Voevodsky's) motives are Schur-finite "modulo divisible morphisms". Yet the author does not know of any nice applications of this fact.

We also obtain interesting results for motives over a finite field K. In this case the action of the Frobenius F on any motif M is finite-dimensional (modulo divisible morphisms). In fact, this is also valid for any K and F if restrictions of F on the pieces of a certain "stratification" of M induce endomorphisms of these pieces. Unfortunately, this condition seems to be rather restrictive.

We also prove that one can lift the Kunneth decomposition of the diagonal (constructed via the Frobenius) to $Chow^{eff}$ "modulo divisible morphisms". We also bound the exponent of "most of" $H^{mot,i}_{s,\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ for $P \in SmPrVar$ (the bound does not depend on v : $(v,p)=1$); this yields a bound on the exponent of the i-th Quillen K-group of P with $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients for $i>1$.

Now we list the contents of the paper.

In §1 we recall the main definitions and properties of Voevodsky's motive (DM^{eff}_{gm}, DM^{eff}_{-} and DM_{gm}). We also remind the main properties of the étale realization of motives and the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum Conjecture (proved recently) that relates étale cohomology with torsion motivic cohomology.

In §2 we prove our main algebraic cycles results. First we prove the vanishing of lower étale cohomology groups of certain motives; this is an easy extension of a result of Arapura and Sastry. Next we prove that (torsion) motivic cohomology of a motif M of some time and the "difference of $H^{mot*}_{l^n}(M)$ with $H^{et*}_{l^n}(M)$" could be expressed as the limit of the étale cohomology of certain other motives. The latter fact is related to the well-known results of the coniveau spectral sequence; the main difference is that we consider the D-terms of the corresponding derived exact couple instead of the E-ones. A similar fact (in a more abstract setting) was proved in [7].

The vanishing of the étale cohomology mentioned together with the computation of the "difference" easily yield that $H^{moti}_{l^n}(M^c_{gm}(A))$ (the motivic cohomology with compact support) of a smooth *embedded* affine A of dimension m vanishes for $i<m$ and $H^{motm}_{l^n}(M^c_{gm}(A)) \subset H^{alg,et m}_{l^n}(M^c_{gm}(A))$ (the étale cohomology of X over the algebraic closure of the base field). Here "embedded" means that A is the complement of a smooth normal crossings divisor of a smooth projective variety; this is certainly always fulfilled in characteristic zero. In order to reduce the comparison result to the case of

an algebraically closed field we apply the motivic version of the Hoschild-Serre spectral sequence. As a partial case, we obtain our version of Artin's vanishing for torsion motivic cohomology (with compact support for smooth affine *embedded* variety); this immediately yields our Weak Lefschetz-type result for torsion motivic cohomology. We also prove that that a class in $H^{et,alg,i}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(P)$, $i<m$, for a smooth projective P of dimension m is algebraic if it becomes algebraic in (some) smooth hyperplane section of P.

We also prove a certain Weak Lefschetz-type statement for algebraic cycles modulo algebraic equivalence groups (with rational coefficients for $\operatorname{char} K=0$ and integral ones for $k=\mathbb{C}$).

In §3 we recall certain properties of the *weight complex* functor $t: DM^{eff}_{gm}\to K^b(Chow^{eff})$ that was defined in [8]. Next we define certain classes of *positive*, *negative* and *obvious* motives. It is easily seen that the (étale K^{alg}) cohomology of positive motives is concentrated in non-positive degrees, the cohomology of negative motives is concentrated in non-positive degrees. It follows that positive motives should have only non-negative cohomology with respect to the (conjectural!) mixed motivic t-structure; negative motives should have non-positive cohomology, whereas obvious motives should be mixed i.e. should lie in the heart of the mixed motivic t-structure (see §3 of [16])). Unfortunately, it seems that this observation does not help to prove any really interesting properties of obvious motives unconditionally. Using our comparison results instead, we prove that the negative morphisms groups between negative and positive morphisms are divisible (in a natural sense) whereas the non-divisible part of the morphisms group of degree zero is controlled by étale cohomology.

In §4 we apply our results to show that the weight complex of an obvious motif becomes *Kimura-finite* in the category of complexes of homological motives. This easily implies that all numerical motives are Kimura-finite; hence numerical motives form a Tannakian category. Besides, we prove that the motivic zeta-function of a smooth projective variety becomes rational "homologically"; it also satisfies a certain functional equation related to those of [23].

In §5 we study motives over finite fields. From the fact that the Frobenius acts finite-dimensionally on obvious motives (modulo divisible morphisms) we easily deduce that the same is true for any (geometric) motif. In particular, one can lift the Kunneth decomposition of the diagonal of $P\in SmPrVar$ to $Chow^{eff}$ "modulo divisible morphisms". A similar method allows to bound the exponent of $H^{mot,i}_{s,\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}}(P)$ for $P\in SmPrVar,\ i<2s-1$.

The author is deeply grateful to prof. H. Esnault, prof. C. Mazza, Dr. K. Zainoulline, and Dr. F. Deglise for their remarks.

In this (first) version some of the proofs are quite sketchy. The author

apologizes for this as well as for all possible inaccuracies and misprints.

Notation. In this paper K will denote a perfect ground field. K^{alg} will denote the algebraic closure of K, G is the absolute Galois group. We fix some embedding $K \to K^{alg}$. For a motif X we denote by X^{alg} the same motif considered over K^{alg}.

p will denote $\operatorname{char} K$ (it could be zero).

For $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ we (sometimes) assume that K could be embedded into the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers, fix an embedding (extending the embedding $K \to K^{alg}$), and denote by H^{sing} the corresponding singular cohomology functor (for varieties and motives over K).

pt is a point, $\mathbb{A}^n$ is the n-dimensional affine space (over K), $\mathbb{P}^n$ is the projective space of dimension n.

We will say that a variety has dimension m only in the case when it is equidimensional of dimension m; yet we will not assume equidimensionality when we will mention inequalities on dimensions or codimensions.

In this paper all complexes will be cohomological i.e. the degree of all differentials is $+1$. A half-exact sequence is a three-term complex that is exact in the middle.

For a category C, $A, B \in ObjC$, we denote by $C(A,B)$ the set of A-morphisms from A into B.

If C is additive then $C \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ will denote a category with the same objects as for C and morphisms tensored by $\mathbb{Q}$. $C\mathbb{Q}$ will usually denote the idempotent completion of $C \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

For a triangulated C and $f \in C(X,Y)$, $X, Y \in ObjC$, we will call the third vertex of (any) distinguished triangle $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \to Z$ a cone of f. Recall that different choices of cones are connected by non-unique isomorphisms, cf. IV.1.7 of [13].

If C is endowed by a t-structure t (see §IV.4 of [13]), $H \in ObjC$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we will denote by $\tau_{\le i} H$ the i-th truncation of H with respect to this t-structure; it is an object whose cohomology is 0 in degrees $> i$ and equals those of H in degrees $\le i$. $\tau_{\le i} H$ was denoted by $H^{t \le i}[-i]$ in §4 of [7].

We will call a full triangulated subcategory $\underline{D} \subset C$ *dense* if all objects of C are direct summands of objects of $\underline{D}$. For $M \subset ObjC$ we will denote by $\langle M \rangle$ the smallest triangulated subcategory of C such that $M \subset Obj\langle M \rangle$. We will say that M *generates* C if $\langle M \rangle$ is dense in C.

RF for an additive functor F means its total derived functor; in particular, $RH^{et}(X,S)$ denotes the complex that calculates the (hyper)cohomology of a variety (motif) X with coefficients in S.

In this paper l will be a (fixed) prime number $\neq p$.

μ_{l^n} denotes the constant étale sheaf of roots of unity of degree l^n.

Ab will denote the category of abelian groups; $\operatorname{Tor} X$ will denote the torsion subgroup of a group X.

$\mathbb{P}$ will denote the set of all (integral) prime numbers $\neq p$.

1 Motives; motivic and étale cohomology: reminder

We would not need much motivic theory in till section 3 (cf. §2.6). For section 2 it suffices to know that there exists an exact functor from a certain "homotopy category" of complexes of varieties to a certain triangulated DM_-^{eff}, whereas for a cohomology theory represented by an object DM_-^{eff} one could construct a certain Gersten resolution.

Yet in §1.1 we will recall some definitions and facts that would be needed in the following sections. Most of them were proved in [28] (at least) for the case of characteristic 0. In the characteristic p the statements needed are true in a certain subcategory of DM_{gm}^{eff}.

In §1.2 we remind the main properties of the étale realization of motives and the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum Conjecture (proved recently) that relates étale cohomology with torsion motivic cohomology.

1.1 On Voevodsky's motives

$SmCor$ will the category of "smooth correspondences" i.e. $ObjSmCor = SmVar$, $SmCor(X,Y) = \sum_U \mathbb{Z}$ for all integral closed $U \subset X \times Y$ that are finite over X and dominant over a connected component of X.

$Shv(SmCor) = Shv(SmCor)_{Nis}$ is the abelian category of additive cofunctors $SmCor \to Ab$ that are sheaves in the Nisnevich topology (when restricted to the category of smooth varieties); these sheaves are usually called "sheaves with transfers". Moreover, by default all sheaves will be sheaves in Nisnevich topology. By an abuse of notation we will also denote by $Shv(SmCor)$ the set of all Nisnevich sheaves with transfers; $D^-(Shv(SmCor))$ is the derived category of $Shv(SmCor)$.

$S \in Shv(SmCor)$ is called homotopy invariant if for any $X \in SmVar$ the projection $\mathbb{A}^1 \times X \to X$ gives an isomorphism $S(X) \to S(\mathbb{A}^1 \times X)$.

$DM_-^{eff} \subset D^-(Shv(SmCor))$ is the subcategory of complexes whose cohomology sheaves are homotopy invariant. In [28] a certain exact functor $M_{gm} : K^b(SmCor) \to DM_-^{eff}$ was defined (in terms of *Suslin complexes* of varieties). Voevodsky's DM_{gm}^{eff} (the category of effective geometric motives) is (equivalent to) the idempotent completion of the categorical image of M_{gm}

(it lies in DM_-^{eff} since DM_-^{eff} is an idempotent complete triangulated category). Recall also that the functor $P \to M_{gm}(P),\ P \in SmPrVar$, extends to a full embedding of $Chow^{eff}$ (the classical category of Chow motives) into DM_{gm}^{eff} (as additive categories).

By an abuse of notation we will sometimes denote by $M_{gm}(P)$ the motif of $P \in SmPrVar$ in categories different from DM_{gm}^{eff} (and $Chow^{eff}$; this includes $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}^{\mathrm{eff}}\mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$).

DM_{gm}^{eff} has a natural tensor structure that could be defined using the relation $M_{gm}(X) \otimes M_{gm}(Y) = M_{gm}(X \times Y)$.

$\mathbb{Z}(1)[2] \in DM_{gm}^{eff}$ is defined as the complement of $M_{gm}(pt)$ as a direct summand of $M_{gm}(\mathbb{P}^1)$; $\mathbb{Z}(i)$ for $i \geq 0$ is the i-th tensor power of $\mathbb{Z}(1)$. The functor $\otimes\mathbb{Z}(1) : DM_{gm}^{eff} \to DM_{gm}^{eff}$ is fully faithful. Following Voevodsky we define DM_{gm} as $\varinjlim_{\otimes\mathbb{Z}(1)} DM_{gm}^{eff}$ i.e. DM_{gm} is the "union" of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(-i)$ while each $DM_{gm}^{eff}(-i)$ is isomorphic to DM_{gm}^{eff}.

For any v prime to $p = \mathrm{char}\, K$ we define

$$\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}(i) = \mathbb{Z}(i) \stackrel{\times v}{\to} \mathbb{Z}(i).$$

Note that $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}(i)$ obviously can decomposed into the sum of its primarycomponents.

Besides, we will consider the triangulated $DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q} \subset DM_-^{eff}$ which is an idempotent completion of $DM_{gm}^{eff} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ (in the latter the objects are the same as for DM_{gm}^{eff} and morphisms are tensored by $\mathbb{Q}$).

We denote by $DM^{pr} \subset DM_{gm}^{eff}$ the idempotent completion of the full subcategory $\langle P,\ P \in SmPrVar\rangle \subset DM_{gm}^{eff}$, DM_{gm}^{s} will denote $DM^{pr}[\mathbb{Z}(-1)] \subset DM_{gm}$. Note that $DM^{pr} = DM_{gm}^{eff}$ for $\mathrm{char}\, K = 0$ (by Corollary 3.5.5 of [28]).

In any characteristic on DM_{gm}^{s} we have a well-defined duality such that $\widehat{\mathbb{Z}(n)} = \mathbb{Z}(-n)$ (see Appendix B of [19] and Theorem 5.18 of [10].). From this it was deduced in loc.cit. that a similar statement is true for $DM_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$ (in any characteristic); in $DM_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$ we denote corresponding Tate motives by $\mathbb{Q}(n)$). Indeed, de Jong's alterations (see [11]) yield that $DM_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$ is the idempotent completion of $DM_{gm}^{s} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

In all cases the duality respects distinguished triangles and $\widehat{M_{gm}}(P) = M_{gm}(P)(-m)[-2m]$ for any smooth projective P of dimension n. For a smooth V of dimension m we denote $\widehat{M_{gm}}(V)(m)[2m]$ by $M_{gm}^{c}(V)$; in particular, $M_{gm}^{c}(P) = M_{gm}(P)$ for P being smooth projective. By Corollary B2 of [19] we have $M_{gm}^{c}(V) \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$ ($ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$ in the characteristic p case). In particular, for $G_m = \mathbb{A}^1 \setminus \{0\}$ we note:

$$M_{gm}(G_m) = M_{gm}^{c}(G_m) = \mathbb{Z}(1)[1] \tag{1}$$

We will call the cohomology of $M^c_{gm}(V)$ the cohomology of V with compact support.

This definition of $M^c_{gm}(V)$ is compatible with those of [28] by Theorem 4.37 of [28]. In particular, we have

$$DM^{eff}_-(M^c_{gm}(X),\mathbb{Z}(n)[i]) = DM^{eff}_-(\mathbb{Z}(m-n),M_{gm}(X)[i-2m])$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $X \in SmVar$ of dimension $m > n$. We will call these groups the motivic homology (or the cohomology with compact support) of X.

We will also need the Gysin distinguished triangle. For a closed embedding $j : Z \to X$, $Z, X \in SmVar$, Z is everywhere of codimension c, $\dim X = m$ (i.e. it is equidimensional, see the convention in the Notation), it has the form

$$M_{gm}(X-Z) \to M_{gm}(X) \stackrel{j^*}{\to} M_{gm}(Z)(c)[2c] \to M_{gm}(X-Z)[1] \qquad (2)$$

(see [10] for the case of an arbitrary perfect K). By Proposition 5.21 of [10] we have

$$j^* = \widehat{j_*}(m)[2m] \text{ for the natural } j_* : M_{gm}(Z) \to M_{gm}(X). \qquad (3)$$

For closed embeddings $i : Y \to X$, $j : Z \to X$ intersecting properly, $f : Z \cap Y \to Y$, $g : Z \cap Y \to Z$ being the embeddings, we have

$$j^* \circ i_* = g_* \circ f^*; \qquad (4)$$

Corollary 4.29 of [10]. Gysin morphisms also respect tensor products; see Corollary 4.30 of [10].

Besides, for various cohomology theories (including motivic cohomology i.e. higher Chow groups) the composition $i_* \circ i^*$ induces the multiplication by the class of Y in $H^*(X)$.

Now we compute some of $M^c_{gm}(X)$. When considering a complex of varieties we will always assume by default that the last term of it is placed in degree 0.

Let $X \in SmVar$, let X equal $P \backslash Y = \cup Y_i, 1 \le i \le m$, where $PinSmPrVar$, Y is a smooth normal crossing divisor. We denote $U_i = \sqcup_{(ij)} Y_{i_1} \cap Y_{i_2} \cap \dots \cap Y_{i_r}$ for all $1 \le i_1 \le \dots \le i_r \le m$. We have r natural maps $U_r \to U_{r-1}$. We denote by d_r their alternated sum (as a finite correspondence). Then

$$M^c_{gm}(X) \cong M = U_m \stackrel{d_m}{\to} U_{m-1} \stackrel{d_{m-1}}{\to} \dots U_1 \stackrel{d_1}{\to} P. \qquad (5)$$

Indeed, in the characteristic 0 case then (5) is Proposition 6.5.1 of [8]. In the characteristic p case and $m = 1$ the statement is easy from (2) and the duality property. Then the general case follows from the Mayer-Viertoris triangle for motives and the functoriality of the Gysin morphism.

Remark 1.1.1. We will call such an $X = P \setminus Y$ an embedded variety. Note that in characteristic zero any smooth quasi-projective X is embedded.

Note that $M_{gm}(X), M^c_{gm}(X) \in ObjDM^{pr}$ for an embedded X.

By an abuse of notation, we will often write X instead of $M_{gm}(X) \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$ (i.e. the motif of X) for $X \in SmVar$; yet in this case we will also denote the direct sum of motives by $\oplus$. We will use a similar convention for numerical and homological motives of smooth projective varieties.

Obviously, the canonical t-structure of $D^-(Shv(SmCor))$ could be restricted to DM^{eff}_-; it is called the homotopy t-structure.

Lastly recall that for any smooth quasi-projective X there exists an affine bundle X'/X (of some dimension $l > 0$) such that X' is affine over K (Jouanolou's trick). One can check that we can take $l = \dim X$. We will call X' a *Jouanolou's replacement* for X. Since X' is Zarisky locally isomorphic to $X \times \mathbb{A}^l$, we obtain that $M_{gm}(X') \cong M_{gm}(X)$ in DM^{eff}_{gm}; cf. Proposition 3.5.1 of [28]. Note that if X is projective then X' is the complement of some hyperplane section of the certain smooth projective variety (the projectivization of the line bundle X'/X).

1.2 Motivic vs. étale cohomology: reminder

We recall that the étale cohomology (with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}$) is a tensor realization of DM^{eff}_{gm}. In particular, any morphism of motives yields a morphism of their étale cohomology.

Our main tool for the study of motivic cohomology is the following well-known statement. It is also the main reason why we study (mostly) torsion motivic cohomology here.

Note that in the formulation below we consider the category of étale sheaves with transfers instead of the category of étale sheaves (that is more common). However this makes no difference: see part 2 of the Remark after Proposition 3.1.3 in [28] and Proposition 3.1.8 ibid.

For $n, r \geq 0$ denote by $\mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}$ some resolution of $\mu^{\otimes r}_{l^n *}$ by injective étale sheaves with transfers considered. This object is independent on the choice of resolution by obvious reasons (it is the the total derived image of μ_n with respect to the corresponding change of topologies functor). For a motif of a smooth variety X we have $D^-(Shv(SmCor))(M_{gm}(X), \mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}) = H^i_{et}(\mu^{\otimes r}_{l^n})(X)$ (here we apply §3.1 of [28] again).

Proposition 1.2.1 (The Beilinson-Lichtenbaum Conjecture)**.** *The natural morphism $\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}(r) \to \mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}$ identifies the former complex with $\tau_{\leq r}\mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}$.*

We recall that this conjecture is equivalent to the Bloch-Kato Conjecture (see [27]). The latter is known for $l = 2$ (see [30]). For odd l it was recently

announced (by Rost and Voevodsky, and (independently) by Weibel) that the missing details for the famous Voevodsky's plan of the proof are completed. If the reader doesn't want to rely on this, he can easily restrict our statements to the case of 2-adic cohomology (some part of Definition 3.3.1 would have to be modified suitably); unfortunately, this will exclude the case $\operatorname{char} K = 2$. Note also that the results of §2.6 do not depend on Proposition 1.2.1.

We recall that $\mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}(s),\ \mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}(s) \in ObjDM^{eff}_-$ for all $s \geq 0$.

For a motif X we denote $DM^{eff}_{gm}(X, \mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}(s)[i])$ by $H^{mot,i}_{v,s}(X)$; $H^{mot,i}_s(X) = DM^{eff}_{gm}(X, \mathbb{Z}(s)[i])$.

Note that in the case when K is algebraically closed (or just contains all roots of unity) all $\mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n r}$ are isomorphic. The choice of these isomorphisms corresponds to the choice of a primitive L^n-th root of unity. In this case we denote $DM^{eff}_-(X, \mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n 0}[i])$ by $H^{eti}_{l^n}(X)$. Here $X \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$.

We denote $H^{et}_{l^n}(X^{alg}/K^{alg})$ (the étale cohomology of X over the algebraic closure of K) by $H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X)$. The usual Kunneth formula implies that

$$H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X \otimes Y) = H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X) \otimes H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(Y); \tag{6}$$

in the sense of the tensor product of complexes (of $\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}$-modules). Certainly $H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X)$ is endowed with the natural action of G. We use similar notation for l^n replaced by an arbitrary v prime to p. We will often call $H^{alg,et*}_{l^n}(X)$ just the étale cohomology of X.

Recall also that (for any $l \in \mathbb{P}$) there exists the $\mathbb{Z}_l$-adic étale realization of DM^{eff}_{gm} (i.e. a cohomological functor $DM^{eff}_{gm} \to \mathbb{Z}_l - mod$). In the general case of motives over S this follows from results of [20]. In our simple case (essentially we consider motives over an algebraically closed field) the usual boundedness results for étale cohomology imply that we can use a very simple definition:

$$H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X) = \varprojlim_n H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X). \tag{7}$$

Certainly for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have a short exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \operatorname{Coker}(H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X) \overset{\times l^n}{\to} H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X)) \to H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X) \\ \to \operatorname{Ker}(H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X) \overset{\times l^n}{\to} H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X)) \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

We also consider $H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X) = H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

2 Artin's vanishing for torsion motivic homology

In this section we calculate some (lower) motivic cohomology groups for motives with compact support of smooth affine varieties. This yields our (tor-

sion motivic cohomology) version of Artin's vanishing and Weak Lefschetz theorems. We also obtain certain interesting results on algebraic classes in cohomology.

In §2.6 in the case $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ we also prove a similar Weak Lefschetz statement for algebraic cycles modulo algebraic equivalence groups (with rational coefficients).

2.1 Some étale cohomology computations: a generalization of a theorem of Arapura and Sastry

By Theorem 6.1.1 of [3] the vanishing of certain Betty cohomology groups with rational coefficients (essentially, of a motif) was proved. We will need this result for étale cohomology over any algebraically closed field. The well-known comparison isomorphism shows that our statement is a generalization of those of [3]. We also weaken some other assumptions of the theorem cited. Yet we are able to apply the method of the proof of [3] in our case (with minor modifications).

Let K be algebraically closed.

Theorem 2.1.1. *Let Y be a proper variety of dimension m, U be its smooth Zarisky open subvariety, H be a closed subvariety of Y (everywhere) of codimension 1 such that $Y \setminus H$ is affine; $U \cap H$ is non-empty.*

Then the induced cohomology maps $H^{etv}_{l^n}(U) \to H^{etv}_{l^n}(U \cap H)$ are bijective for $v < m-1$ and are injective for $v = m-1$.

Proof. We can assume that Y is connected. We denote $V = U \setminus H$, $W = Y \setminus H$. We have a cartesian square of open immersions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V & \xrightarrow{i'} & U \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle j'} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle j} \\ W & \xrightarrow{i} & Y \end{array}$$

We denote $U \cap H$ by X, $g : X \to U$ is the closed embedding.

In this proof all the categories of sheaves we consider will be categories of étale $\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}$-module sheaves (denoted by $Sh_?((\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})-mod)$); we will not include this information in the notation for constant sheaves, (hyper)cohomology and functors between functor categories. Below we use the standard properties of the Grothendieck's six functor formalism. Recall that one can compute the "usual" étale cohomology of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$ via $Sh_?((\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})-mod)$; to see that, one could note that the Godement resolution of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$ consists of sheaves of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-modules.

We have an exact sequence of (étale $\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}$-) sheaves

$$0 \to i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V \to (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_U \to g_*(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_X \to 0.$$

Hence the assertion is equivalent to $H^v(U, i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V) = 0$ for $v \le m-1$.

Now $H^v(U, i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V) = \mathbb{H}^v(Y, Rj_*i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V)$.

Next we apply Verdier duality (see §3 of [12]): $R\mathbb{H}(Y, Rj_*i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V)$ is dual (in the derived category of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-modules) to $R\mathbb{H}(Y, D_YRj_*i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V)$. Here for $F \in D^b_{const}(Sh_V((\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})-mod))$ we define $D_Y(F) = R\operatorname{Hom}_Y(F, p_Y^!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}))$, $p_Y : Y \to pt$ is the projection. Hence it suffices to prove that $R\mathbb{H}(Y, D_YRj_*i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V)$ is acyclic in dimensions $> m$ (we use the fact that $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$ is a principial ideals ring).

Now we have $\mathbb{H}^{-v}(Y, D_YRj_*i'_!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V) = \mathbb{H}^{-v}(Y, j_!Ri'_*D_V((\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V))$.

Since V is smooth, $p_V^!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}) = (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})[2m]$ by Theorem 3.2.5 of [12]; hence the latter group equals $\mathbb{H}^{2m-v}(Y, j_!Ri'_*(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V)$.

Next, we have $j_!Ri'_* = Ri_*j'^!$. Hence the group in question equals

$$\mathbb{H}^{2m-v}(Y, Ri_*(j'^!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V) = \mathbb{H}^{2m-v}(W, j'^!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V) = H^{2m-v}(W, j'^!(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})_V).$$

Now the Artin's vanishing theorem yields the result (since W is smooth affine of dimension m).

□

Remark 2.1.2. 1. Alternatively, using the obvious exact sequences we could have reduced the statement to the case $n = 1$. Then the proof would simplify since the (Verdier) duality of complexes used above could be replaced by the duality of their cohomology. In fact, for $n = 1$ exactly the same argument as in [3] could be applied.

2. It seems that for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ an alternative method of the proof seems to be possible. At least is in the cases we actually need below, the motif $X \to Y$ could probably be "decomposed" (in the sense of distinguished triangles) into motives with compact support of (smooth) affine varieties. Unfortunately, it seems difficult to check this statement without the resolution of singularities (in characteristic p). Alterations are not sufficient for our purposes since we work with finite coefficients.

3. The same proof also yields the statement for singular cohomology (with integral coefficients). We will apply this statement in §2.6 below.

In fact, a certain "Weak Lefschetz for algebraic cycles with rational coefficients modulo algebraic equivalence" already follows from the rational version of this statement or from a (slightly weaker) Theorem 6.1.1 of [3]; see Theorem 2.6.3 below.

2.2 The expression of motivic cohomology of certain motives in terms of certain étale cohomology

Let K be an arbitrary perfect field.

Let $H \in ObjDM_-^{eff}$. We denote $\tau_{\le i}H$ by H' (i is fixed). We denote by H'' the "complement of H' to H" i.e. $H'' = \mathrm{Cone}(H' \to H)$. Note that the cohomology of H'' is concentrated in degrees $> i$.

Let $U \in SmVar$, let $X = \cup X_i, 1 \le i \le u$, $u \ge 0$, be a smooth normal crossing divisor in U. For all $r > 0$, $1 \le i_1 \le \cdots \le i_r \le u$ we denote $T_{(i_j)} = X_{i_1} \cap X_{i_2} \cap \cdots \cap X_{i_r}$; $U_r = \sqcup_{(i_j),\ 1 \le j \le r} T_{(i_j)}$, and $U_0 = U$. We have r natural maps $f_{ri} : U_r \to U_{r-1}$. We denote by d_r their alternated sum (as a finite correspondence). We denote by M the motif

$$U_u \xrightarrow{d_u} U_{u-1} \xrightarrow{d_{u-1}} \dots U_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} (U_0 = U) \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}. \tag{9}$$

In order to compare H and H'-cohomology of M we will prove a formula that calculates its H''-cohomology. We fix some $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 2.2.1. *Let (Y_0, Y_1) run through open subschemes of U such that $U \setminus Y_k$ is of codimension $\ge j - i - k + 1$ in U ($k = 0, 1$), $Y_1 \subset Y_0$. For all $1 \le i_1 \le \cdots \le i_r \le s$ denote $Y_k \cap T_{(i_j)}$ by $S_{k,(i_j)}$, $Y_{kr} = \sqcup_{(i_j):\ \#i_j = r} S_{k,(i_j)}$. We define the motives $L_k = Y_{ks} \to \cdots \to Y_{k1} \to Y_k$ for $k = 0, 1$ similarly to (9) (so we have natural morphisms $L_k \to M$).*

Then we have an isomorphism

$$DM_-^{eff}(M, H''[j]) \cong \varinjlim \mathrm{Im}(DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H[j]) \to DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H[j])).$$

Here connections between cohomology of L_k for different sets (Y_0, Y_1) are induced by inclusions of varieties.

Proof. Shifting H we can easily reduce the statement to the case $i = 0$.

We claim that $\varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(N_k, H''[r]) = 0$ for any $r \le j - k$; here $N_k = \mathrm{Cone}(L_k \to M)$, $k = 0, 1$.

Recall that the inductive limit of (long) exact sequences is exact. Hence it easily seen (by "slicing" $H[i]$ into its t-cohomology) that it suffices to prove a similar statement is also valid for H'' replaced by any homotopy invariant $S \in Shv(SmCor)$ shifted by $v < j - k$.

First let $u = 0$. Then our (last) assertion (for $M = U$) easily follows from Lemma 4.36 and Theorem 4.37 of [29]; see also §4.6.3 of [5]. In fact, in this case our statement could be considered as a part of the well known calculation of the second level of the coniveau spectral sequence (cf. Corollary 6.3 of [6]).

A similar assertion (shifted by r) is valid for all U_r (here we also take the limit with respect to (Y_0, Y_1)). In order to see this it suffices to note that for

any $1 \le i_1 \le \dots \le i_r \le s$ any $S_{k,(i_j)}$ such that $T_{(i_j)} \setminus S_{k,(i_j)}$ is of codimension $\ge j-k-i-r+1$ in $T_{(i_j)}$ could be completed to some Y_0, Y_1. Besides, we certainly use the fact that any $S_{k,(i_j)}$ is either empty or has dimension $m-r$.

Now suppose that $u=1$. Then we have an exact sequence

$$\{0\} = \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(Y_k \to U, S[v]) \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(N_k, S[v]) \\ \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(Y_{k1} \to U_1, S[v-1]) = \{0\}$$

for $k=0,1$, $v<j-k$; this yields the claim in this case. The case of $u>1$ could be easily obtained from similar exact sequences by induction.

Therefore we have exact sequences

$$\{0\} = \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(N_0, H''[j]) \to DM_-^{eff}(M, H''[j]) \\ \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H''[j]) \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(N_0, H''[j+1]) = \{0\}$$

and

$$\{0\} = \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(N_1, H''[j]) \to DM_-^{eff}(M, H''[j]) \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H''[j]) \to \dots$$

Similarly to the reasoning above, "slicing" H' into t-pieces one can easily prove that $\varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H'[j+1]) = \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H'[j]) = \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H'[j+1]) = \{0\}$.

Hence the obvious morphism $\varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H[j]) \to \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H''[j])$ is surjective whereas $\varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H[j]) \cong \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H''[j])$.

Now we consider the commutative diagram (rows are not exact!):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H[j]) & \longrightarrow & \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H[j]) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \downarrow h \\ DM_-^{eff}(M, H''[j]) & \xrightarrow{t} & \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H''[j]) & \xrightarrow{p} & \varinjlim DM_-^{eff}(L_1, H''[j]) \end{array}$$

We have proved that t and h are is bijective, g is surjective, and p is injective. This immediately yields the assertion required.

□

Remark 2.2.2. 1. Our methods also easily yield that for any j we have:

$$DM_-^{eff}(M, H'[j]) \cong \varinjlim \mathrm{Im}(DM_-^{eff}(N_0, H[j]) \to DM_-^{eff}(N_1, H[j])). \quad (10)$$

The main differences of this statement from the usual comparison of spectral sequences (as in [6]) is: we calculate the D-terms of the corresponding exact couple instead of the E-ones; we compute cohomology of certain motives

(instead of varieties). Note that this statement along with the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum Conjecture (Proposition 1.2.1) yields a way to express motivic cohomology of motives of the type described in terms of their étale cohomology.

Unfortunately, in the general case $\varinjlim H^{eti}_{l^n}(N_k)$ and $\varinjlim H^{eti}_{l^n}(L_k)$ could be huge. For this reason we never apply (10) below; when applying Proposition 2.2.1 we will actually only use the fact that $\varinjlim \mathrm{Im}(DM_-^{eff}(L_0, H[j])$ surjects onto $DM_-^{eff}(M, H''[j])$.

2. An easy generalization of our method allows to compute (motivic) cohomology of more general "complexes" of correspondences; we only need the codimentions of preimages of points (of U_{r-1} in U_r) would be greater than their codimension (in U_r).

3. Instead of considering limits of cohomology of motives we could have taken cohomology of the corresponding pro-motives as it was done in §4 of [10]; this wouldn't have affected the proof substantionally. Unfortunately, the category of pro-motives is not triangulated (if we define it in the obvious way).

Note also that Deglise have studied the comparison of the spectral sequences mentioned in loc.cit.

4. The author currently studies a certain (more complicated) category of pro-motives which is triangulated. Its properties together with the general formalism of *weight structures* that was introduced in [7] should probably yield: one could apply (a generalization of) our method for the calculation of H''-cohomology of an arbitrary Voevodsky's motif M. Part 8 of Theorem 4.4.2 of [7] is an abstract triangulated version of this statement (whereas part 7 of loc. cit. corresponds to (10)). In particular, in order to calculate the H^t-cohomology an arbitrary $U_s \to \cdots \to U_0$ one should study H-cohomology of some motives. These motives could be decomposed into Postnikov towers ("cut into pieces") such that their pieces come from coniveau of X_i (similarly to our statement). In order to prove the latter assertion one should apply Lemma 1.5.4 of [7]. Yet is not clear whether one could describe these Postnikov towers explicitly without any codimension assumptions (as in part 2 of this remark). The problem is to relate limit of the cohomology of Y_{kr} (with respect to Y_k) with the coniveau spectral sequence for the cohomology of U_r.

5. One could also generalize (10) in the following way. Let $r \geq i$, denote $\tau_{\leq r}H$ by G. Then for the corresponding map of cohomology theories $H' \to G$ we have

$$\mathrm{Im}(G^j(M)) \to H'[j](M)) \cong \varinjlim \mathrm{Im}(H^j(N_0)) \to H^j(N_{r-i+1})). \qquad (11)$$

Here N_{r-i+1} is defined similarly to N_0, N_1 in Proposition 2.2.1 (we demand $Y_{r-i+1} \subset Y_1$). This statement corresponds to the calculation of the D-terms

of the higher derived couples for the coniveau spectral sequence; cf. also Theorem 4.4.2 of [7].

In particular, when K contains a primitive l^n-th root of unity then one can define certain maps $H^{moti}_{l^n\ s} \to H^{moti+j}_{l^n\ s+j}$ for any $j > 0$ and calculate their images using (11).

2.3 The case when étale cohomology majorates the motivic one

Now we prove the main technical results of this paper.

We adopt the notation of the previous subsection. First we assume that K is algebraically closed; take $H = \mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n}$ and specify M in more detail. Let U be a smooth Zarisky open subvariety of a smooth projective variety P of dimension m, let $J = \cup J_i,\ 1 \le i \le u,\ u > 0$ be a smooth normal crossing divisor P such that $P \setminus J$ is affine; let $T = U \cap J$ be non-empty. We consider $X_i = J_i \cap U$ and define M in the same way as above.

Theorem 2.3.1. *For any M as above and any $s \ge 0$ we have $H^{motr}_{l^n\ s}(M) = \{0\}$ for $r < m$ (r could be negative) whereas $H^{motm}_{l^n\ s}(M)$ naturally injects into $H^{etm}_{l^n}(M)$.*

Proof. We take $H = \mathcal{H}^{et}_{l^n}$, $i = s$, $j = r$ and adopt the notation used above. By Proposition 1.2.1 we have $H' = (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})(s)$. Therefore it remains to verify that $DM^{eff}_{-}(M, H''[v]) = 0$ for $v < m$.

First we consider the case $v > s$.

It suffices to prove that $DM^{eff}_{-}(L_0, H[v]) = \{0\}$ for $s < v < m$ and any choice of Y_0. Then Proposition 2.2.1 would yield the claim.

We verify the latter statement.

First let $u = 1$. By Theorem 2.1.1 the induced cohomology maps $H^v(Y_0) \to H^v(X_0)$ are bijective for $v < m - 1$ and are injective for $v = m - 1$. This yields our claim in this case.

Now we reduce the case $u > 1$ to Theorem 2.1.1. To this end it suffices to check that the étale cohomology of J equals the cohomology of $U_u \stackrel{d_u}{\to} U_{u-1} \stackrel{d_{u-1}}{\to} \cdots \to U_1$. This could be easily checked by induction in u using the standard cohomological descent technique; note that all $J_i \to J$ are proper.

The case $v \le s$ is even easier; it suffices to note that in this case $L_1 = \varnothing$ (at least, if P is connected).

□

Now we prove a similar result for the motivic cohomology of M as in Theorem 2.3.1 for K being an arbitrary perfect field.

We recall that K^{alg} denotes the algebraic closure of K; M^{alg} denotes M considered as a motif over K^{alg}, G is the absolute Galois group of K, $H^{alg,et,r}_{l^n}(M) = H^{et,r}_{l^n}(M^{alg}/K^{alg})$.

Theorem 2.3.2. *Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}: \ (v,p) = 1$, $s \geq 0$.*

Then for any $r < m$ we have $H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(M) = \{0\}$ whereas $H^{mot,m}_{v,s}(M)$ naturally injects into $(H^{et,alg,m}_{v}(M)(m))^G$ (we twist the G-module by (m)).

Proof. Decomposing $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}$ into the sum of its primary components, we reduce the assertions to the case $v = l^n$. Next we apply the same method of the proof as for Theorem 2.3.1.

We take the same H, i, j as above. It again remains to verify that $DM^{eff}_{-}(M, H''[r]) = 0$ for $r < m$. Indeed, the image of $H^{mot,m}_{v,s}(M)$ in $H^{et,alg,m}_{v}(M)(s)$ is obviously G-stable. Hence the assertion reduces to: for any $r < m$ either $DM^{eff}_{-}(L_0, H[r]) = \{0\}$ for any Y_0 or $L_1 = 0$ (for connected P).

As we have shown above, we have $H^{alg,et,r}_{l^n}(L_0) = 0$ for $s < r < m$ whereas the case $r \leq s$ is trivial. Hence it suffices to construct for L_0 and all s the usual Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence $H^p_G(H^{alg,et,q}_{l^n}(L_0)(s)) \Longrightarrow H^{et,p+q}_{l^n\,s}(L_0)$.

For M of the type described the construction of the spectral sequence desired is rather easy since no transfers are needed. It order to obtain it one can use the formalism of §9 of [18]; see Definition 9.2.1 of loc.cit. Proposition 9.4.2 of loc.cit. (when adjusted to the much more simple case of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-cohomology) easily yields the spectral sequence desired.

Note also that the Example following Proposition 2.1.2 of [17] allows to construct the Hochschild-Serre spectral sequence for an arbitrary $M \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$. Indeed, Huber decomposes $H^{et0}_{l^n}$ as $H \circ R$; here R is a (realization) functor $DM^{eff}_{gm} \to D^b(SH^{et}_{(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})}(K)) = D^b((\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})[G] - mod)$, $H : D(G - mod) \to Ab$ is the the hyperderived functor for the functor $X \to X^G$ (on the category of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})[G]$-modules).

□

2.4 Corollaries: Artin's vanishing and Weak Lefschetz for torsion motivic cohomology

Here we will never demand K to be algebraically closed.

First for any $X \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $s \geq 0$, we consider a short exact sequence obtained from the definition of $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}(s)$; we also introduce some

notation:

$$0 \to A^i_{v,s}(X) = \mathrm{Coker}(H^{mot,i}_s(X) \overset{\times v}{\to} H^{mot,i}_{v,s}(X)) \to H^{mot,i}_{v,s}(X) \\ \to B^{i+1}_{v,s}(X) = \mathrm{Ker}(H^{mot,i+1}_s(X) \overset{\times v}{\to} H^{mot,i+1}_{v,s}(X)) \to 0. \tag{12}$$

We will denote $A^i_{v,s}(M_{gm}(V))$ (resp. $B^i_{v,s}(M_{gm}(V))$) by $A^i_{v,s}(V)$ (resp. $B^i_{v,s}(V)$).

We can separate $A^i_{v,s}(X)$ from $B^{i+1}_{v,s}(X)$ in our results.

For $v:\ (v,p)=1$ being a product of distinct $l_i \in \mathbb{P}$, $s \geq 0$, any $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ we denote

$$H^{alg,et,r}_{\mathbb{Z}_v}(X) = \oplus_{l_i|v} H^{alg,et,r}_{\mathbb{Z}_{l_i}}(X);$$

(we use the same notation for $\mathbb{Z}_{l_i}$-étale cohomology as for the $\mathbb{Z}_l$-one); see (8).

Proposition 2.4.1. *Let v, s, M be the same as in Theorem 2.3.2. For $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ we denote $C_r = \mathrm{Coker}(H^{et,alg,r}_{\mathbb{Z}_v}(M)(s) \overset{\times v}{\to} H^{et,alg,r}_{\mathbb{Z}_v}(M)(s))$.*

Then for any $r < m$ (including negative r) we have $A^r_{v,s}(M) = B^{r+1}_{v,s}(M) = 0$ whereas $A^m_{v,s}(M)$ naturally injects into C^G_m.

Proof. The assertion for the case $r < m$ follows Theorem 2.3.2 immediately (by (12)).

Now let $r = m$. Again decomposing $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}$ into the sum of its primary components, we reduce the assertions to the case $v = l^n$.

We have a cycle class map from motivic cohomology to $\mathbb{Z}_l$-adic étale one (being the limit of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-class maps). Hence we obtain a morphism of short exact sequences (from (12) to (8)):

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} A^m_{v,s}(M) & \overset{\hookrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} & H^{mot,m}_{v,s}(M) & \overset{\twoheadrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} & B^{m+1}_{v,s}(M) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ C_m & \overset{\hookrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} & H^{alg,et\,m}_{l^n}(M) & \overset{\twoheadrightarrow}{\longrightarrow} & D_{m+1}. \end{array}$$

Hence the injectivity of the middle column yields the injectivity of the left-hand one. It remains to note that all the maps are G-invariant.

□

Next, using Theorem 2.3.2 we extend to (torsion) motivic cohomology the well-known properties of étale cohomology (the letter only hold for separably closed K).

Theorem 2.4.2. *Let $v \in \mathbb{Z}:\ (v,p)=1,\ s \geq 0$.*

1. Let A be an embedded affine variety (see Remark 1.1.1) of dimension m. Then $H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(M^c_{gm}(A)) = \{0\}$ for $r < m$.

2. Let H be a smooth hyperplane section of a smooth projective P of dimension m. Then the induced map $H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(P) \to H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(H)$ is bijective for $r < m-1$ and injective for $r = m-1$.

Proof. 1. This is a partial case of Theorem 2.3.2 for $U = P$.

2. $P \setminus H$ is affine. Hence our assertion is immediate from assertion 1 and the long exact sequence

$$\dots \to H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(M^c_{gm}(P \setminus H)) \to H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(P) \to H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(H) \to \dots$$

□

Remark 2.4.3. 1. Assertion 1 of the corollary could be called the Artin's Vanishing theorem for torsion motivic homology (recall that it equals motivic cohomology with compact support). For a non-embedded A (in characteristic p) one can use alterations to bound the exponent of $H^{mot,r}_{v,s}(M^c_{gm}(A))$ for $r < m$ (independently on v).

2. Assertion 2 is the torsion motivic cohomology version of the Weak Lefschetz theorem.

3. Note that (as in Proposition 2.4.1) the bijectivity in assertion 2 also holds separately for $A^r_{v,s}$ and $B^{r+1}_{v,s}$; this is obvious.

Repeating the latter statement one easily obtains the following result.

Let v, s, P be the same as in Theorem 2.4.2; let $P_m \subset P_{m-1} \subset \dots P_1 \subset P_0 = P$ be a sequence of closed embeddings such that P_i is a smooth hyperplane section of P_{i-1} (for $0 < i \le m$). We denote $A^r_{v,s}$ (resp. $B^r_{v,s}$) defined similarly to Proposition 2.4.1 with P_i instead of M by A^r_i (resp. B^r_i); A^r_0 (resp, B^r_i) will be denoted by A^r (resp., B^r).

Then for any $u < m$ we have $A^u \cong A^u_{m-1-u}$, $B^u \cong B^u_{m-u}$ whereas A^u injects into A^u_{m-u}. We are also able to express the image of this injection in terms of étale cohomology of P and P_{m-u}; see below.

Note that the existence of some P_i follows follows from the usual Bertini's theorem when K is infinite. When K is finite one should apply a version of it proved in [26].

4. For $P = X \times Y$ instead of considering smooth hyperplane sections of P we can choose smooth hyperplane sections $X' \subset X$ and $Y' \subset Y$. Then we obtain a similar (to part 2 of Theorem 2.4.2) comparison statement for $H^{mot*}_{l^n}(X \times Y)$ and $H^{mot*}_{l^n}(X \times Y' \cup X' \times Y)$. Note that the latter is isomorphic to $H^{mot*}_{l^n}(X \times Y' \to X \times Y' \oplus X' \times Y)$.

In particular, this statement seems useful for the study of correspondences (in the usual Chow sense) $X \to Y$. The author hopes that it could help to prove the famous Lefshetz Standard Conjecture; see also Corollary 2.5.3 below.

2.5 On algebraic classes in cohomology

Our result easily imply that a class in cohomology in small dimension is algebraic if it becomes algebraic at a smooth hyperplane section,

Suppose that $P \in SmPrVar$, $\dim P = m$, H is its smooth hyperplane section, $j : H \to P$ is the embedding.

Proposition 2.5.1. *Let $i < m$. If for $a \in H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(H)$ its image in $H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(H)$ belongs to $j^*(H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(P))$ then $a \in j^*(H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(P))$.*

Proof. So, we should check that $H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(H)/j^*(H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(P))$ injects into $H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(H)/j^*(H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(P))$. Let $M = Y \to P \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$. We consider the following morphism of short exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(Y)/j^*(H^{moti}_{l^n\ s}(P)) & \xrightarrow{\hookrightarrow} & H^{moti+1}_{l^n\ s}(M) & \xrightarrow{\twoheadrightarrow} & \mathrm{Ker}(H^{moti+1}_{l^n\ s}(P) \to H^{moti+1}_{l^n\ s}(Y)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(Y)/j^*(H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(P)) & \xrightarrow{\hookrightarrow} & H^{moti+1}_{l^n\ s}(M) & \xrightarrow{\twoheadrightarrow} & \mathrm{Ker}(H^{alg,et_i+1}_{l^n\ s}(P) \to H^{alg,et_i+1}_{l^n\ s}(Y)). \end{array}$$

By Theorem 2.3.2 (for $U = P$, $J = H$), the middle column is an injection. Hence the left-side column also is.

□

Remark 2.5.2. 1. Certainly, for $i < m - 1$ any element of $H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(H)$ comes from $H^{alg,et_i}_{l^n\ s}(P)$ (by Weak Lefschetz for étale cohomology).

2. We can apply the result several times (to find out which algebraic classes in multiple hyperplane sections of X come from X); cf. part 3 of Remark 2.4.3.

Recall that for $X \in SmPrVar$ an element of $H^{et,alg,2s}_{\mathbb{Z}_l,s}$ (the cohomology with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_l(s)$), $H^{et,alg,2s}_{\mathbb{Q}_l,s}$, or H^{sing2s} is called an *algebraic class* if it comes from some algebraic cycle (everywhere) of codimension s on X (with $\mathbb{Z}$ ir $\mathbb{Q}$-coefficients). We denote the corresponding cohomology group (for any of the theories) by $H^{2s}_s(X)$.

Corollary 2.5.3. *Let H be any of the cohomology theories mentioned above.*

Then for any $s \le (m-1)/2$ a class in $H^{2s}_s(P)$ is algebraic if it becomes algebraic in $H^{2s}_s(Y)$.

Proof. Recall that algebraic classes form a finitely generated abelian group. Hence it suffices to prove a similar statement for $\mathbb{Z}_l$-algebraic classes in $H^{et,alg,2s}_{\mathbb{Z}_l,s}$. Obviously it suffices to prove the latter in the case of $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$-coefficients (for all n). Lastly, with finite coefficients the claim is a partial case of Proposition 2.5.1.

□

Remark 2.5.4. 1. The statement proved allows to make certain reductions for the Hodge and Tate conjectures. Recall that the Hard Lefschetz theorem allows to reduce the conjectures to the case of $H^i(P)$, $i \leq \dim P$. Therefore Corollary 2.5.3 reduces the conjectures to the case of H^{2n} for smooth projective P of dimension $2n$.

Besides, the conjectures become much easier if P has a "simple" (multiple) smooth hyperplane section.

2. For $k = \mathbb{C}$ we will prove a stronger statement below (see Theorem 2.6.3).

2.6 Weak Lefschetz for cycles modulo algebraic equivalence for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$

Now we replace the usage of the Beilinson-Lichtenbaum conjecture (Proposition 1.2.1) by the usage of certain results of [6]. This yields interesting results on (algebraic) cycles modulo algebraic equivalence for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$.

For $X \in SmPrVar$ we denote the group of (integral) cycles of codimension r in X modulo algebraic equivalence by $A^r(X)$.

Let $M = U_s \to \cdots \to U_0 \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$ be a motif considered in (9). Then for any complex of Zarisky sheaves C ("without transfers") one can easily define the (hyper)cohomology of M with coefficients in C; we will denote it by $C^*(M)$. To this end one should replace C by a quasi-isomorphic injective (or flabby) complex C' and define $C^*(M)$ as the cohomology of the total complex of the double complex $C'^j(U_i)$. This definition is obviously functorial in M (considered as a "complex of varieties") and C.

Proposition 2.6.1. *Let $K = \mathbb{C}$, $s \geq 0$. Denote by $\mathcal{H}^s$ the Zarisky sheaf associated to the presheaf $U \to H^{sings}(U)$.*

Then for any $r < m$ we have $\mathcal{H}^{r-s}(M) = \{0\}$ for $r < m$ (r could be negative) whereas $\mathcal{H}^{m-s}(M)$ naturally injects into $H^{singm}(M)$.

Proof. We denote by H some complex of injective topological sheaves that represents H^{sing*}; note that injective topological sheaves are acyclic Zarisky sheaves (when restricted to the category of schemes).

By part 3 of Remark 2.1.2, for U and H as in Theorem 2.1.1 we have: $H^{singv}(U) \to H^{singv}(U \cap H)$ is bijective for $v < m-1$ and injective for $v = m-1$. Then (almost) the same reasoning as in Theorem 2.3.1 shows that assertions similar to those desired hold for $\tau_{\leq i}H^*(M)$ for all i. Note only: in order to obtain the corresponding analogue of Proposition 2.2.1 one should replace the usage of Lemma 4.36 and Theorem 4.37 of [28] (in the consideration of the case $s = 0$) by the usage of Proposition 3.9 of [6].

Alternatively, in order to apply Proposition 2.2.1 directly one could represent H^{sing} by an object of DM_-^{eff}; this is possible if one bounds the dimensions of varieties considered (see §7.5 of [8]).

Now, our claim is immediate from the long exact sequence

$$\dots \to (\tau_{\le s-1}H)^{r-1}(M) \to \mathcal{H}^{r-s}(M) \to (\tau_{\le s}H)^r(M) \to \dots$$

□

Remark 2.6.2. We could have avoided the consideration of $\tau_{\le i}H^*$ by applying Theorem 6.1 of [6] instead of (an analogue of) Proposition 2.2.1.

Now the results of Bloch and Ogus easily imply the following result. Let $\operatorname{char} K = 0$.

Theorem 2.6.3. *Let Y be a smooth hyperplane section of a smooth projective P of dimension m.*

I 1. The map $h : A^r(P) \otimes \mathbb{Q} \to A^r(Y) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ is bijective for $2r < m-1$ and injective for $2r = m-1$.

2. The image of h for $2r = m-1$ consists of elements whose images in $H^{sing 2r}(Y)$ come from $H^{sing 2r}(P)$.

II If K is algebraically closed then similar statements hold for $A^*(-)$ (instead of $A^*(-) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$).

Proof. An obvious Galois descent reasoning reduces assertion I to assertion II. Moreover, we can assume $k = \mathbb{C}$.

Now we recall that in this case we have $A^p(X) \cong \mathcal{H}^p(X)$ for any $X \in SmPrVar$; this is Corollary 7.4 of [6].

Hence exactly the same argument as in the proof of part 2 of Theorem 2.4.2 (with Proposition 2.6.1 instead of Theorem 2.3.2) yields assertion 1.

The proof of assertion 2 is almost the same as those of Corollary 2.5.3; it is even simpler since here we don't have to deduce our "integral" result from a certain "torsion" one (i.e. from something like Proposition 2.5.1).

□

Remark 2.6.4. Unfortunately, we don't have any "higher Chow" analogues of Theorem 2.6.3. The latter should be related to the (non-existent yet?) "theory of mixed motives up to algebraic equivalence"; see the end of [32].

The lack of "higher" analogues prevents us from applying Theorem 2.6.3 below. Yet the author hopes to construct certain "higher" theory using the formalism of twisted complexes (as in [8]); possibly this theory will be related to the bivariant morphic cohomology of Friedlander and Lawson.

In particular, such a theory should yield that for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ all algebraic motives are Schur-finite (see [25] and §4.1); hence all Chow ones also are (the implication is given by Corollary 3.2 of [32]).

3 Obvious motives and their morphisms

We construct a class OM of *obvious motives* that "should be" mixed i.e. lie in the heart of the (conjectural!) motivic t-structure (as the intersection of the classes of *positive motives* and *negative motives*). We prove that this class is closed with respect to products and dualization; besides it generates DM^{pr}. There are no non-divisible negative degree morphisms between motives in OM and degree zero morphisms are controlled by étale cohomology (modulo divisible morphisms).

In order to make some auxiliary computations in DM_{gm}^{eff} and relate our results with homological motives we apply the weight complex functor t (introduced in [8]).

3.1 Some computations; the weight complex functor

We recall that in §6 of [8] there was a *weight complex* exact functor $t : DM^{pr} \to K^b(Chow^{eff})$ defined (see Proposition 6.3.1 ibid.); it extends (essentially, from motives with compact support of varieties) the weight complex functor W defined in [14]. It is a tensor functor (see Proposition 8.5.1 of [8]); it extends to the whole DM_{gm}^{eff} in the case $\operatorname{char} K = 0$. It also could be rationally extended to a $t\mathbb{Q} : DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q} \to K^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$; see §8.3 of [8].

For $X \in ObjDM^{pr}$ we will write $X \in DM^{pr\,[a,b]}$ if $t(E)$ is (homotopy equivalent to) a complex concentrated in degrees from a to b, $b \geq a$. We denote $\cup_{a \leq b} DM^{pr\,[a,b]}$ by $DM^{pr \leq b}$; $DM^{pr \geq a} = \cup_{b \geq a} DM^{pr\,[a,b]}$.

We will need the following properties of t.

Proposition 3.1.1. *1. The map $t_* : DM^{pr}(X,Y) \to K^b(Chow^{eff})(t(X), t(Y))$ is surjective if $X \in DM^{pr \geq a}$, $Y \in DM^{pr \leq a+1}$.*

2. If for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $X, Y \in DM^{pr\,[a,a+1]}$ then $t(X) \cong t(Y) \implies X \cong Y$.

3. For $X \in DM^{pr}$ let $t(X) = A \stackrel{f \oplus g}{\to} B \oplus C \stackrel{h \oplus (-i)}{\to} D$ for $A, B, C, D \in ObjChow^{eff}$, $f \in Chow^{eff}(A,B)$, $g \in Chow^{eff}(A,C)$, $h \in Chow^{eff}(B,D)$, $i \in Chow^{eff}(C,D)$, $h \circ f = i \circ g$. Then $X \cong \operatorname{Cone}(A \stackrel{f}{\to} B) \stackrel{j}{\to} (C \stackrel{i}{\to} D)$ for some j. Note that by assertion 2 the objects $(A \stackrel{f}{\to} B)$ and $(C \stackrel{i}{\to} D)$ are well-defined up to isomorphism.

Proof. 1. For $t(X), t(Y)$ being complexes of $M_{gm}(P)$ for $P \in SmPrVar$ the statement is exactly part 1 of Remark 6.2.2 of [8]; in fact, this is the only case we actually need below. The general case could be easily reduced to this partial one by applying Proposition 6.4.1 of [8]; see also Part VII2 of

Theorem 3.3.1 of [7]. Note that the statement cited are valid for $\operatorname{char} K > 0$ also; see §8.3 of [8].

2. By assertion 1, the isomorphism $t(X) \to t(Y)$ could be lifted to some morphism $f \in DM_{gm}^{eff}(X, Y)$. The conservativity of t implies that f is an isomorphism since $t(f)$ is.

Alternatively, the statement easily follows from the fact that a cone of a morphism is determined by it up to a (non-unique) isomorphism.

3. Assertion 1 yields the existence of a morphism $k \in DM_{gm}^{eff}((C \xrightarrow{i} D), X)$ such that $t(k)$ is the obvious "inclusion" of a subcomplex. We have $t(\operatorname{Cone} k) \cong (A \xrightarrow{f} B)[1]$. Hence assertion 2 yields the result.

□

We also recall that for $X \in ObjDM^{pr}$, $t(X) = (P_i)$ (a complex of Chow motives P_i) there exists a "filtration" (i.e. a Postnikov tower) for X whose "repetitive factors" are P_i. This means that there exists a sequence of objects $X^{\leq b}$, $X^{\leq b} = 0$ for B small enough and $= X$ for b large enough, and distinguished triangles $P_i[-i] \to X^{\leq i} \to X^{\leq i-1}$ for all i. See part 4 of Proposition 2.6.1 of [8] for the proof.

The same is true (in the rational sense) for any object of $DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$.

3.2 The definition of *positive*, *negative*, and *obvious* Voevodsky motives

Definition 3.2.1. I We will denote by PM (the class of positive motives) the smallest subclass of $ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$ (or of any other version of the category of Voevodsky's motives) containing $M_{gm}(A)[-m]$ for all A/K smooth affine embedded of dimension m, that satisfies the following conditions.

(i) If $A, C \in PM$, $A \to B \to C$ is a distinguished triangle, $A, C \in PM$, then $B \in PM$.

(ii) If $A \in PM$ then any direct summand of A is positive.

(iii) If $A \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$, $A(m) \in PM$ for some $m > 0$ then $X \in PM$.

(iv) If $A \in PM$, $i < 0$ then $A[i] \in PM$.

II We define NM (the class of *negative motives*) as $\{X \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff} : \widehat{X}(m) \in PM$ for some m. Here $\hat{X}$ is the dual to X in DM_{gm}; see subsection 1.1.

III $OM = PM \cap NM$ (the class of *obvious motives*).

Remark 3.2.2. 1. Note that (1) immediately implies that $\mathbb{Z}(1) \in OM$. Hence Part I1 of Proposition 3.2.3 (below) implies that PM, NM and OM are closed with respect to (positive) Tate twists.

2. The definition easily implies that NM could be defined as the closure of $\{M^c_{gm}(A)[-m]\}$ (for all A/K smooth affine embedded of dimension m) with respect to operations (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) with the shift inverted; see part I of Proposition 3.2.3 (below).

We prove that our classes of motives are closed with respect to tenzor products and that obvious motives generate DM^{pr} (in the sense specified in the Notation).

Proposition 3.2.3. *I 1. If $X,Y \in PM$ (resp. NM, resp. OM) then $X \otimes Y \in OM$.*

2. If $A,C \in PM$, $A \to B \to C$ is a distinguished triangle, $A,C \in NM$ (resp. OM), then $B \in PM$ (resp. OM).

3. $M^c_{gm}(A)[-m] \in NM$ for all A/K smooth affine embedded of dimension m.

4. If $X \in OM$ then $\widehat{X}(m) \in OM$ for m large enough.

5. Let $X \in SmPrVar$ be connected of dimension m, let $Y,Z \subset X$ be smooth hyperplane sections intersecting properly. Then

$$M = ((Y \setminus Y \cap Z) \to (X \setminus Z))[-m] \in OM$$

and

$$M' = (M^c_{gm}(X \setminus Z) \to M^c_{gm}(Y \setminus Y \cap Z)(1)[2])[-1-m] \in OM.$$

II $\langle OM \rangle \subset DM^{eff}_{gm}$ contains DM^{pr}.

Proof. I 1. Easy, since DM^{eff}_{gm} is a tensor triangulated category. Indeed, it suffices to apply the fact the product of smooth embedded affine varieties is smooth embedded affine.

2. Easy, since duality reverts distinguished triangles.

3. Immediate from the definition of M^c_{gm}.

4. Immediate from the definition of OM.

5. First we verify the assertion for M.

$(Y \setminus Y \cap Z)$ and $X \setminus Z$ are smooth affine embedded. Hence the distinguished triangle $(X \setminus Z)[-m] \to M \to (Y \setminus Y \cap Z)[1-m]$ yields $M \in PM$.

It remains to prove that $M \in NM$. We fixed the notation for closed embeddings: $i : Y \to X$, $j : Z \to X$, $f : Z \cap Y \to Y$, $g : Z \cap Y \to Z$. Then

$$t(M) = (Y \overset{i_* \oplus f^*}{\to} X \oplus (Y \cap Z)(1)[2] \overset{j^* \oplus (-g_*)}{\to} Z(1)[2])[-1-m], \qquad (13)$$

see (4). Hence part 3 of Proposition 3.1.1 yields a distinguished triangle $M^c_{gm}(Z \setminus Y \cap Z)(1)[1-m] \to M \to M^c_{gm}(X \setminus Y)[-m]$; here we apply (3). This yields $M \in NM$; see Remark 3.2.2.

The assertion for M' could either be obtained by applying Poincare duality or by the same method.

II It suffices to check that all motives of smooth projective varieties belong to $Obj\langle OM\rangle$. To this end we apply a simple construction; a version of it was applied in the end of [4] for purposes similar to ours but in the context of perverse sheaves.

Let $P \in SmPrVar$ be connected, $\dim P = m$. We choose a smooth normal crossing family of $2m$ hyperplane sections $G_1, \dots, G_m, F_1, \dots, F_m$ of P. Note that the existence of such a family follows from the usual Bertini's theorem when K is infinite. When K is finite one should apply a version of it proved in [26].

Denote $P_{rs} = \cap_{1\le i\le r} F_i \bigcap \cap_{1\le i\le s} G_i$ (i.e. $P = P_{00}$). We denote the closed embeddings $f_{rs} : P_{rs} \to P_{r-1,s}$ and $g_{rs} : P_{rs} \to P_{r,s-1}$. Note that here we do not distinguish the case $P_{rs} = \varnothing$ (this is always so for $r + s > m$); we also put $P_{rs} = \varnothing$ if $r < 0$ or $s < 0$.

We take

$$M_{rs} = ((P_{rs+1} \setminus P_{r+1,s+1}) \to (P_{rs} \setminus P_{r+1,s}))(r)[2r].$$

We have $M_{rs} \in OM[r - s + m]$ by assertion I5.

Next, define $N_i = \oplus_{r-s=i} M_i$. Note that $N_i \in OM[i + m]$; $N_i = 0$ for $i > m$ and $i < -m$.

We also define

$$P_i = \mathrm{Cone}(\oplus_{r-s=i,\ s\ge 0} M_{gm}(P_{rs+1})(r)[2r] \overset{\oplus((f^*_{r+1s+1} \bigoplus g_{rs+1*})(r)[2r])}{\to} \oplus_{r-s=i,\ r>0} M_{gm}(P_{rs})(r)[2r]),$$

here we do not include into the sums the arrows one of whose ends is missing;

$$P' = \mathrm{Cone}(\oplus_r M_{gm}(P_{rr+1})(r)[2r] \overset{\oplus((f^*_{r+1r+1} \bigoplus g_{rr+1*})(r)[2r])}{\to} \oplus M_{gm}(P_{rr})(r)[2r]).$$

Then we have $P_{m+1} = P_{-1-m} = 0$. Part 3 of Proposition 3.1.1 yields distinguished triangles $P_{i+1}[-1] \to N_i \to P_i$ for $i \ne 0$, $P_1[-1] \to N_0 \to P'$, and $P \to P' \to P_0$; see (13). This yields the result.

□

Remark 3.2.4. 1. We will easily see below that the Artin's vanishing theorem along with Theorem 2.4.2 implies that the (étale K^{alg}-) cohomology of positive motives is concentrated in non-positive degrees, the cohomology of negative motives is concentrated in non-positive degrees. It follows that positive motives should have only non-negative cohomology with respect to the (conjectural!) mixed motivic t-structure; negative motives should have non-positive cohomology, whereas obvious motives should be mixed i.e. should

lie in the heart of the mixed motivic t-structure. The latter observation is related to those of [9].

In particular, these facts (on "mixed motivic cohomology") would be true with respect to Hanamura's t-structure (see §3 of [16]; recall that Hanamura's construction is purely conjectural!). Recall that Hanamuras's motivic category is anti-equivalent to (Voevodsky's) $DM_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$; see the proof in §4 of [8]. These statements also should be fulfilled according to Hypothesis 0.0.21 of [31] if we additionally assume that Voevodsky's (conjectural) motivic t-structure respects Poincare duality.

However it seems that the papers mentioned do not help to prove any really interesting properties of obvious motives unconditionally. We will use Theorem 2.3.2 as our main tool instead. Besides, most of "standard" conjectures only consider motives with rational coefficients. Hence our ("torsion") results below do not follow from these conjectures directly; they could rather serve as a "complement" to them. For example, rational Artin's vanishing theorem for motivic homology (see part 1 of Remark 2.4.3) follows from "standard motivic" conjectures; along with part 1 of Theorem 2.4.2 this would yield the corresponding integral result.

Note also that such a result (or any "reasonable" version of Theorem 2.3.2 for rational motivic cohomology) would allow to extend our main results to $Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$. In particular, we proved Proposition 3.2.3 for DM_{gm}^{eff}. Unfortunately, proving a "rational version" of Theorem 2.3.2 seems to be out of reach at the moment; note that this result would be a (vast) generalization of the Beilinson-Soulé Vanishing Conjecture.

2. We proved that P could be presented as a certain "triangulated version of complex" of obvious motives of length $2m$. It does not seem difficult to generalize this fact to any object of $\langle P:\ P \in SmPrVar\rangle$. These statements are related to a general belief that any (effective geometric) Voevodsky's motif could be presented as a complex of mixed motives (possibly in the sense of t-structures). Unfortunately, our methods do not seem to imply that OM could be embedded into any abelian category of "mixed" motives. So we don't know how to construct the "canonical filtration of a complex in OM".

3. The motives described in part I5 have étale cohomology of length two i.e. of three distinct weights. The problems described above are related to the fact that we cannot split them into pure motives i.e. obvious motives whose cohomology is pure. Note also that standard conjectures (do not seem to) imply that "enough" pure motives exist on the integral level.

4. There are no (non-zero) morphisms of positive degrees between Chow motives in DM_{gm}^{eff} (and hence in $DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$; see Proposition 6.7 of [5]); this easily implies that there are no morphisms of degrees > 2 between M_{ij} (see

the proof of assertion II).

More vanishing results are valid when K is finite; see part 1 of Remark 5.2.3.

5. We could have applied the Jouanolou's trick (see the end of §1.1) to P before "cutting it into pieces" (in the proof of assertion II). Then we would get similar distinguished triangles distinguished triangles $P_{i+1}[-1] \to N_i \to P_i$ for all i whereas the last of P_i will be isomorphic to $M_{gm}(P)$. We will (essentially) use this method in §5.

6. In the proof of assertion II we could have taken all $F_i = G_j = H$ for a single smooth hyperplane section H of P. To this end we should choose smooth representatives for the "self-intersections" of H in the sense of the Chow ring (using Bertini-type arguments similar to those above). Having this interesections one can easily lift (with respect to t) the complexes $(P_{rs+1}[-1] \to P_{r+1,s+1}(1)[1] \oplus P_{rs}[-1] \to P_{r+1s}(1)[1])(r)[2r]$ to some $M_{rs} \in ObjDM^{pr}$ (in fact, all complexes of length 2 could be lifted). The argument used in the proof of I5 would easily yield $M_{rs} \in OM[r-s+m]$. It remains to note that all calculations of the proof of part II were made on the level of weight complexes.

3.3 Divisible groups and phantom motives

Our definitions will depend on $p = \operatorname{char} K$, yet we will ignore this in the notation since p is fixed. The category of homological motives will also depend on l (if $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ then it actually does not depend on l rationally).

Definition 3.3.1. 1. For an abelian group G an element will be called *divisible* if for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $p \nmid n$ there exists $g_n \in G$ such that $hg_n = g$.

2. The set of divisible elements of G will be denoted by $\operatorname{Div} G$ and called the *divisible part* of G.

3. $G/\operatorname{Div} G$ will be called the *codivisible part* of G; we denote it by $\operatorname{CoDiv} G$.

4. For any (additive) category C $X, Y \in ObjC$, $f \in C(X,Y)$ will be called divisible if it is divisible as an element of $C(X,Y)$.

5. For an abelian G we will denote by $\operatorname{Tor}_{(\mathrm{p})}(G)$ the torsion of G of order prime to p.

6. $G/\operatorname{Tor}_{(\mathrm{p})} G$ will be called the *cotorsion part* of G; we denote it by $\operatorname{CoTor} G$.

7. $X \in ObjC$ where $C = DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$ (resp. $K^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$, resp. $K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$)) will be called *phantom* if it could be presented as the "image" of an idempotent $p : X \to X$ for some $X \in ObjD \subset ObjC$ and $p \in \operatorname{Div} D(X,X) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$ where $D = DM_{gm}^{eff}$ (resp. $K^b(Chow^{eff})$, resp. $K^b(Chow)$)).

We will denote the class of phantom objects of C by $\mathrm{Ph}(C)$.

8. For a fixed prime $l \neq p$ we will write $f \backsim_{hom} g$ for $f, g \in ObjChow^{eff}(X, Y)$, $X, Y \in ObjChow^{eff}$ if f, g induce the same morphisms on $H^{alg,et*}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}$.

9. $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}$ will denote the category such that $Obj\,\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}} = ObjChow^{eff}$ and $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}(X, Y) = Chow^{eff}(X, Y)/\backsim_{hom}$.

$\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}$ will denote the idempotent completion of $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}} \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

10. We denote by $t_{hom} : DM^{pr} \to K^b(Chow)$ (resp. $t_{hom}\mathbb{Q} : DM^{eff}_{gm}\mathbb{Q} \to K^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$ the composition of t (resp $t\mathbb{Q}$) with the natural functor $K^b(Chow) \to K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}})$ (resp. $K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q}) \to K^b(\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$).

Remark 3.3.2. 1. Obviously, for any G the divisible part and the p-torsion of $\mathrm{CoDiv}\, G$ is zero; the group $\mathrm{CoTor}\, G$ cannot have any l-torsion for $(l, p) = 1$.

2. For any C divisible morphisms form an ideal i.e. the composition of any divisible morphism with an arbitrary morphism is divisible.

3. It is easily seen that for C as in part 7, any phantom $X \in ObjC$ and arbitrary $Y \in ObjC$ we have $X \otimes Y \in \mathrm{Ph}(C)$.

4. Recall also that any object of $K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$ (resp. $DM^{eff}_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$) is a direct summand of some object that comes from $K^b(Chow)$ (resp. $DM^{pr} \subset DM^{eff}_{gm}$).

We study the relations between the definitions introduced.

Proposition 3.3.3. *1. Any divisible morphism (in $DM^{eff}_{gm} \supset Chow^{eff}$) induces zero morphisms on $\mathbb{Z}_l$- étale cohomology.*

2. If $X \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}\mathbb{Q}$ or $K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$ is phantom then its image in $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$ is zero.

Proof. 1. If $f : X \to Y$ is a morphism of motives, $l^n f$ induces the zero morphism on $H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X)$ for any $X \in ObjDM^{eff}_{gm}$ (since $H^{alg,et}_{l^n}(X)$ is l^n torsion). Hence the assertion is immediate from (7).

2. Obviously, it suffices to prove the statement for $K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$.

Next, by definition the statement reduces to: if for some $X, Y \in ObjK^b(Chow)$ we have $f \in \mathrm{Div}(K^b(Chow)(X, Y))$ then f becomes zero in $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}})$. Obviously, it suffices to prove this statement in $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_l)$.

By definition, f modulo $l^n(C^b(Chow^{eff})(X, Y))$ for every n could be presented as $dg_n + g_n d$ for some collection of arrows $g_{ni} \in Chow^{eff}(X_i \to Y_{i-1})$. It remains to note that $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}} \otimes \mathbb{Z}_l(X_i, Y_{i-1})$ are finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}_l$-modules; therefore there exists some $g = (g_i) :\ g_i \in Chow^{eff}(X_i \to Y_{i-1})$ such that $f \backsim dg + gd$.

□

Remark 3.3.4. Certainly, the argument above shows that a phantom $X \in K^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$ vanishes in a certain category $K^b(Chow_l)$. Here $Chow_l$ is defined as the idempotent completion of a category whose objects are (integral) Chow motives and $Chow_l(P,Q) = (\varprojlim_n (Chow(P,Q)/l^n Chow(P,Q))) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$.

3.4 The study of morphisms between classes of motives described

Now we study the cases when étale cohomology controls morphisms between motives of the classes described.

Proposition 3.4.1. *1. If $X \in NM$, $Y \in PM$ then $DM^{eff}_{gm,l^n}(X[i],Y)$ is divisible for $i > 0$.*

2. If $X \in NM$, $Y \in PM$ then

$$\mathrm{CoDiv}(DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y)) \subset \oplus_l \mathrm{CoTor}(\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(Y), H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X)));$$

here the map $DM^{eff}_{gm,l^n}(X,Y) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(Y), H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(X))$ is obtained from the functoriality of $H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}$.

3. Let $X \in NM$, $Y, Y' \in PM$, $f \in DM^{eff}_{gm}(Y,Y')$. Suppose that for each $l \in \mathbb{P}$ $(\neq p)$ the induced map $f^* : H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(Y') \to H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(Y)$ is surjective. Then $\mathrm{Ker}\, f_* : DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y) \to DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y')$ consists of divisible elements.

4. Let $X, X' \in NM$, $Y \in PM$, $f \in DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,X')$. Suppose that for each $l \in \mathbb{P}$ $(\neq p)$ the corresponding induced map $H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X') \to H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X)$ is injective. Then $\mathrm{Ker}\, f^* : DM^{eff}_{gm}(X',Y) \to DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y)$ consists of divisible elements.

5. For $X_1, X_2 \in NM$, $Y_1, Y_2 \in PM$, $v > 0$ prime to p, we have

$$DM^{eff}_{gm}(X_1,Y_1)/vDM^{eff}_{gm}(X_1,Y_1) \otimes DM^{eff}_{gm}(X_2,Y_2)/vDM^{eff}_{gm}(X_2,Y_2) \\ \subset DM^{eff}_{gm}(X_1 \otimes X_2, Y_1 \otimes Y_2)/vDM^{eff}_{gm}(X_1 \otimes X_2, Y_1 \otimes Y_2).$$

Proof. 1. Using part I of Proposition 3.2.3 and duality we easily reduce the statement to $DM^{eff}_{gm}(X, \mathbb{Z}(i)[j])$ being divisible for all $i \geq 0 \geq j$, $X \in NM$. Note that we don't have to consider negative Tate twists here since $\mathbb{Z}(1) = M^c_{gm}(G_m)[-1] = M_{gm}(G_m)[-1] \in OM$ (see (1)).

Applying part 1 of Remark 3.2.2 we easily obtain that it suffices to prove the latter assertion for $X = M^c_{gm}(A)[-m]$ for A smooth affine embedded of dimension m. Hence the statement follows immediately from part 1 of Theorem 2.4.2; see (12).

2. We should check that any $f \in Chow^{eff}(X,Y) \setminus \mathrm{Div}\, Chow^{eff}(X,Y)$ induces a non-zero morphism on $\mathrm{CoTor}\, H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(Y) \to \mathrm{CoTor}\, H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Z}_l}(Y)$ for

some l. Since $H^{alg,et}_{l^n}$ is a rigid tensor realization of DM_{gm}, arguing as above we easily reduce the statement to the case $X = M^c_{gm}(A)[-m]$, A is smooth affine embedded of dimension m, $Y = \mathbb{Z}(i)$, $i \geq 0$. Next, $H^{motm}_{l^n}(M^c_{gm}(A))$ is non-p-torsion free by Proposition 2.4.1.

Since $f \notin \operatorname{Div} Chow^{eff}(X,Y)$, it is not divisible by some l^n (for $l \in \mathbb{P}$ and $n > 0$). Hence it suffices to check that any non-zero $g \in DM^{eff}_{gm}(M^c_{gm}(A)[-m], (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})(i))$, gives a non-zero class in $H^{alg,et_m}_{l^n}(M^c_{gm}(A))$. The latter fact is part 1 of Theorem 2.4.2.

3. Obviously, assertion 2 yields that

$$\operatorname{CoDiv}(DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y)) \subset \oplus_l \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(Y), H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X)); \qquad (14)$$

the same is true for Y'. Hence f_* injects $\operatorname{CoDiv}(DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y))$ into $\operatorname{CoDiv}(DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y))$; this yields the result.

4. The claim could could be very easily deduced from assertion 2 by the reasoning (exactly) dual to those for part 3. Alternatively, we can note that the statement desired is the dual to assertion 3.

5. The same reasoning as above (along with (12)) yields that for $X, Y \in OM$ we have $DM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y)/vDM^{eff}_{gm}(X,Y) \subset \operatorname{Hom}(H^{alg,et}_v(X), H^{alg,et}_v(Y))$. Now it suffices to apply the fact that $H^{alg,et}_v$ is a tensor realization of DM^{eff}_{gm}. □

Remark 3.4.2. Certainly we could have separated distinct l in assertions 3 and 4.

4 All numerical motives are finite-dimensional; divisible motivic zeta functions are rational

The results of section 3 easily imply that obvious motives are "almost" (i.e. up to phantom objects) finite dimensional in the sense of Kimura. This easily implies that (*divisible* and homological) motivic zeta functions of smooth projective varieties are rational and satisfy a functional equation similar to those of Theorem 2 of [23]. Besides, all numerical motives are Kimura-finite; this implies that $\operatorname{Mot}^{\text{eff}}_{\text{num}}$ is Tannakian!

We also describe a possible approach to the proof of the Standard Kunneth Conjecture.

4.1 Obvious motives and their weight complexes of are (divisibly) finite-dimensional

We use definitions similar to those of [23]; see also [21] and [24].

Definition 4.1.1. Let C be a tensor additive category, $M \in ObjC$.

1. We will denote by $\curlywedge^r_M$ the morphism $\sum_{\sigma \in S_r} (-1)^{i(s\sigma)} \sigma_{*M^{\otimes r}}$ (we permute the components of the tensor power).

2. If C is a $\mathbb{Q}$-category then we will denote by $\curlywedge^r_M$ the "image" of the idempotent $\curlywedge^r_M / r!$.

3. If C is a $\mathbb{Q}$-category then we denote by $Sym^r(M)$ the r-th symmetric power of M i.e. the "image" of $\sum_{\sigma \in S_r} \sigma_{*X^{\otimes r}}/r!$.

4. M will be called *evenly finite-dimensional* if for some $s > 0$ the morphism $\curlywedge^{s+1}_X$ is 0.

5. M will be called *divisibly finite* if $\curlywedge^{s+1}_M$ is divisible for some $s > 0$.

6. The smallest such s in parts 4,5 will be called the *dimension* of X and denoted by $\dim X$.

6. If C is a $\mathbb{Q}$-category then M will be called *Kimura-finite* if it could be decomposed as $M_+ \oplus M_-$ and there exist some $r, s > 0$ such that $\curlywedge^{s+1}_{M_+} == Sym^{r+1}(M_-) = 0$. We will denote by $\dim M$ the minimal sum of $r + s$.

Remark 4.1.2. 1. Note that both $\curlywedge^r_M$ and $Sym^r(M)$ are direct summands of $M^{\otimes r}$ (by definition).

2. Obviously if $r > s$ then $\curlywedge^{s+1}_X = 0 \implies \curlywedge^{r+1}_X = 0$.

3. Obviously, if C is a $\mathbb{Q}$-category and M is evenly finite-dimensional then it is also Kimura-finite with $M_+ = M$, $M_- = 0$. Besides, for all triangulated categories considered we will have: $M[1]$ is Kimura-finite if M is with $M[1]_+ = M_-[1]$ and $M[1]_- = M_+[1]$.

In the case $M = M_-$ the object M is called *oddly finite dimensional*.

By Proposition 6.3 of [24] the *even* and *odd* parts of M (i.e. M_+ and M_-) are well-defined up to an isomorphism.

4. Our definition of evenly finite-dimensional objects is an integral version of the usual (Kimura's) definition for objects of $\mathbb{Q}$-categories with $\otimes$.

5. When dealing with tensor categories (especially, triangulated ones) there is the problem for putting correct signs for morphisms. The author apologizes for not paying much attention to this issue. Yet note that for categories of complexes (of pure motives of any sort) we use the usual sign convention whereas switching the components in $M_{gm}(P) \otimes M_{gm}(P)$ is induced by switching components of $P \times P$.

A crucial observations here is: our convention is compatible (via t) with the tensor structure on DM^{pr} (defined as in §8.5 of [8]) as well as with the usual (graded commutative) tensor product of étale cohomology. See also part 3 of this remark.

In order to calculate the dimension of obvious motives we will need some étale cohomology notation and computations.

Remark 4.1.3. For $M \in ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$ we denote $\sum_i (-1)^{i+j}(H_{\mathbb{Q}_l}^{alg,et,i}(M))$ by $\chi(M)$. It is easily seen that $\chi(M)$ does not depend on l. Indeed, $\chi(M)$ is an Euler characteristics for an object of DM_{gm}^{eff} i.e. for a distinguished triangle $X \to Y \to Z$ we have $\chi(Y) = \chi(X) + \chi(Z)$. Hence it remains to note that for any $X \in DM_{gm}^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$ there exists a "filtration" (i.e. a Postnikov tower) for X whose "repetitive factors" are rational Chow motives; see §3.1. This reduces the claim to the well known independence on l statement (for Chow motives).

Note also that $\chi(M_{gm}(X))$ for X being a (smooth) variety is just the ordinary Euler characteristic of X.

Let $(v, p) = 0$.

Proposition 4.1.4. *1. If $X \in PM$ then $H_v^{alg,et,i} = 0$ for $i > 0$.*

2. If $X \in NM$ then $H_v^{alg,et,i} = 0$ for $i < 0$.

3. If $X \in OM$ then $H_v^{alg,et,i} = 0$ for $i \neq 0$.

4. For $X \in OM$, $t(X) = (P_i)$ (the complex whose terms are P_i) we have $\dim(H_{\mathbb{Q}_l}^{alg,et,0}) = \sum_i (-1)^i \chi(P_i)$.

Proof. 1. If $X = M_{gm}(A)[-m]$ for A smooth affine (not necessarily embedded) of dimension m then the statement is just Artin's vanishing theorem (for étale cohomology of affine varieties over an algebraically closed field). Now recall that a general $X \in PM$ could be obtained from $M_{gm}(A)[-m]$ by operations that preserve negativity of cohomology.

2. For $X = M_{gm}^c(A)[-m]$ for A smooth affine embedded of dimension m the statement follows is part 1 of Theorem 2.4.2. The general case could be easily deduced like those of assertion 1; see part 2 of Remark 3.2.2.

3. Immediate from assertions 1 and 2.

4. Indeed, we have $\sum_i (-1)^i \chi(P_i) = \chi(M)$. It remains to recall that the étale cohomology of X is concentrated in degree zero.

□

Theorem 4.1.5. *Let $X \in OM$. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. X and $t(X)$ are divisibly finite.

2. $t_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}(X)$ is evenly finite-dimensional.

3. All the dimensions equal $\chi(X)$.

Proof. Recall that t is a tensor functor; hence the divisible finiteness of $t(X)$ reduces to those of X with $\dim t(X) \leq \dim X$. Besides, Proposition 3.3.3 yields that $t_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}(X)$ is evenly finite-dimensional if X is X is divisibly finite and $\dim(t_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}(X)) \leq \dim X$.

Hence for $s = \chi(X)$ it obviously suffices to check that:

$\mathrm{I}_X^{\curvearrowright s+1}$ is divisible (in $DM_{gm}^{eff}(X^{\otimes s+1}, X^{\otimes s+1})$).

II $t_{\hom}\mathbb{Q}(\widehat{X^r}) \neq 0$ for $r \leq s$.

The proof of I:

By part I1 of Proposition 3.2.3 we have $X^{\otimes r} \in OM$ for any $r > 0$. By definition, we should check that $\widehat{\ }^{s+1}_{t(X)}$ is divisible; hence it suffices to check a similar fact for $\widehat{\ }^{s+1}_{X}$ (in DM^{eff}_{gm}).

By (14) it suffices to check that (for any $l \neq p$) $\widehat{\ }^{s+1}_{X}$ induces a zero morphism on $\mathbb{Q}_l$-étale cohomology of $X^{\otimes s+1}$. This is very easy since the étale cohomology (over K^{alg}) is a tensor realization of DM^{eff}_{gm} and $H^{alg,et}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X) \approx \mathbb{Q}_l^s$.

The proof of II:

Suppose that $r \leq s$, let $t_{hom}\mathbb{Q}\widehat{\ }^r_X = (P_i)$ (a complex of P_i).

Hence the assertion would follow from the following fact: at least one of the complexes $H^{alg,etj}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(P_{-i})$ (j is fixed) is not acyclic. Now for $X = (P_i)$ we have a spectral sequence

$$E_1^{pq} = H^{alg,etq}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(P^{-p}) \implies H^{alg,etp+q}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(\widehat{X^r}); \tag{15}$$

see Theorem 2.4.1 of [7]. Since $H^{alg,et0}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(\widehat{X^r}) \neq \{0\}$, we obtain the result. □

Remark 4.1.6. Following C. Mazza, we could have introduced the notion of a *Schur-finite* motif; see Definition 1.3 of [25]. The notion of Schur finiteness has the two-out of three property in DM^{eff}_{gm} (see Proposition 5.3 of [25]) and any direct summand of a Schur-finite motif is Schur-finite. It follows that each Chow (and Voevodsky's) motif is Schur-finite "modulo divisible morphisms". Unfortunately, it seems that this fact (without strong bounds on the "dimension") does not yield any interesting consequences (at least, unless one assumes some of "standard" conjectures).

Still it would be interesting to prove that all Chow and Voevodsky's motives are Schur-finite (without "modulo divisible morphisms"). The author hopes to do this at least for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$; see Remark 2.6.4.

4.2 Numerical motives are Kimura-finite

We denote by $\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}}$ the category of effective numerical motives with rational coefficients. Composing $t\mathbb{Q}$ with the natural functor $Chow\mathbb{Q} \to \mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}}$ one gets a functor $t_{num} : DM^{eff}_{gm}\mathbb{Q} \to K^b(\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}})$.

Theorem 4.2.1. *Any object of* $\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}}$ *is Kimura-finite.*

Proof. It obviously suffices to prove the statement for objects of $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}})$.

By part 2 of Theorem 4.1.5, $t_{num}(X)$ is evenly finite dimensional if X is obvious. Next, $\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{num}}$ is an abelian semisimple category (see [22]). Therefore

in $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}^{\mathrm{eff}})$ all distinguished triangle split. Next, a direct sum of Kimura-finite objects is Kimura-finite (a standard easy reasoning; see Proposition 2.16 of [21]). We obtain that any object of $\langle t_{num}(X) : X \in OM \rangle$ is Kimura-finite. Next, a direct summand of a Kimura-finite object is Kimura-finite also by Proposition 3.28 of [21]. We conclude that all objects of $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}^{\mathrm{eff}})$ are Kimura-finite.

□

Certainly, this result immediately extends to the category $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ of all numerical motives (with rational coefficients). We immediately obtain that $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ is (essentially) Tannakian.

Corollary 4.2.2. $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ *is Tannakian (if we modify the commutativity constraint for the tensor product on it).*

Proof. The claim follows from Theorem 4.2.1 immediately by Theorem 9.2.2 of [2]. See also Theorem 3.32 of [21].

□

Note lastly that the case of numerical motives is especially simple (for the theory of Kimura-finiteness): since $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}$ is semisimple, there are no morphisms between even and odd objects. In particular, in order to yield our statements it suffices to know the statements cited only for this very simple situation.

4.3 Towards the proof of the Standard Kunneth Conjecture

Now we describe the consequences of our results (for homological motives) and propose a method for the proof of the Standard Kunneth Conjecture. In this section we only consider homological and numerical motives with rational coefficients. We fix some prime $l \neq p$ and denote $H^* = H^{alg,et*}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}$.

An easy lifting idempotents modulo nilpotents arguments imply: each numerical motif (considered as a direct summand of $M_{gm}(P),\ P \in SmPrVar$) has a unique indecomposable ("minimal") lift to $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}^{\mathrm{eff}}\mathbb{Q}$. Recall also that homological motives satisfy the Krull-Schmidt theorem since that all the morphisms spaces are $\mathbb{Q}$-finite dimensional. Therefore, each $M_{gm}(P)$ could be uniquely (up to an isomorphism) decomposed in $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}^{\mathrm{eff}}\mathbb{Q}$ into a sum of indecomposable summands; any summand numerically is either zero, or evenly, or oddly finite dimensional. Relatively easy trace calculations (see Corollary 3.21 of [21]) yield that the dimension of an indecomposable homological motif M equals $|\chi(M)|$ where $\chi(M) = \sum(-1)^i \dim_{\mathbb{Q}_l} H^i(M)$. Besides, (an

indecomposable!) M becomes evenly finite-dimensional in $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}^{\mathrm{eff}}$ whenever $\chi(M) > 0$; M is numerically zero whenever $\chi(M) = 0$.

Now suppose that we have a complex M of homological motives. Then we can "cancel" the maximal possible number of direct summands of components of M. This means that we replace M (as a complex of homological motives, i.e. not up to a homotopy equivalence) by a minimal direct summand $M' = (P_i)$ (a complex of homological motives P_i) of it that is homotopy equivalent to M in $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}^{\mathrm{eff}}\mathbb{Q})$. The complement of M' to M could be decomposed into a direct sum of isomorphisms of homological motives. The connecting morphisms of M' will be numerically zero (since $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}}^{\mathrm{eff}}$ is semisimple). Therefore, numerically all $P_i[-i]$ are direct summands of M.

Next, let $M = t_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}(X)$ for $X \in OM$. Since M is evenly finite-dimensional, all P_i (coming from M' as above) are numerically evenly finite dimensional for even i and oddly finite dimensional for odd i.

We will say that a smooth projective X satisfies the Standard Kunneth Conjecture if there exist $P_i \in Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}(X, X),\ 0 \le i \le 2\dim X$ (i.e. correspondences with rational coefficients) such that each P_i induces the identity morphism $H^i(P)$ and 0 on all other $H^j(X)$. Note that such P_i (obviously) become idempotents in $\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}^{\mathrm{eff}}\mathbb{Q}$.

We easily obtain: if X satisfies the Kunneth Conjecture then the direct summand of its homological motif are in one-to-one correspondence to the direct summands of its numerical motif. Each indecomposable homological submotif of $M_{gm}(X)$ has only one cohomology group, is Kimura-finite, and its parity is the same as those of the number of this group (i.e. it is even if its cohomology is concentrated in degree $2j$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}$).

We will say that $X \in SmPrVar$ satisfies the (homological) *Sign Conjecture* if there exist two correspondences $P_{pm} \in Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}(X, X),\ 0 \le i \le 2\dim X$ such that $P_- + P_+ = id_{M_{gm}(X)}$; P_+ induces the identity morphism on all $H^{2j}(X)$ and 0 on all $H^{2j+1}(X)$ (for P_- obviously the converse is fulfilled). The Sign Conjecture is well-known to be equivalent to the Kimura-finiteness of $M_{gm}(X)$ and imply the equality of numerical and homological dimensions of indecomposable (homological) motives. It is certainly weaker than the Kunneth Conjecture.

Now suppose that any $P \in SmPrVar$ of dimension $< m$ satisfies the Kunneth Conjecture. Note that it is obvious for $\dim P = 0$.

We try to verify the conjecture for some $X \in SmPrVar$, $\dim X = m$.

We consider the same M as in part I5 of 3.2.3. Again the existence of M follows from the Bertini-type statements mentioned above. We have

$$t_{hom}\mathbb{Q}(M) = Y \to X \oplus (Y \cap Z)(1)[2] \to Z(1)[2])[-1-m] \qquad (16)$$

by (13).

Obviously (by the Krull-Schmidt arguments) it suffices to provide a Kunneth decomposition of $X \oplus (Y \cap Z)(1)[2]$. By the inductive assumption there exist Kunneth decompositions of Y and Z. We consider a certain M' as above.

We conjecture that the following statement is valid.

Conjecture 4.3.1. *The connecting morphisms of M' are homologically zero.*

This would easily yield the Kunneth decomposition of X. Indeed, then the middle component P_m of M' (those coming from $X \oplus (Y \cap Z)(1)[2]$) would only have non-zero cohomology in dimension 0. Here we apply the degeneration of the weight spectral sequence (15).

Therefore the homological motif of X splits as a sum of certain summands of $M_{gm}(Y)$ and $M_{gm}(Z)$ and a summand with a single non-zero cohomology group. Since the Kunneth Conjecture is fulfilled for Y and Z, we obtain that indecomposable direct summands of $M_{gm}(X)$ have only single non-zero cohomology groups; this obviously yields the Kunneth Conjecture for X.

In order to prove Conjecture 4.3.1 one probably should calculate the dimensions of P_i. Note that the dimension of an even-dimensional X equals the categorical trace of id_X; see Theorem 9.17 of [2] and Corollary 3.21 of [21]. It follows that the dimension of M as a complex of homological motives coincides with its "numerical dimension" and with $\chi(M) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}_l} H^0(M)$. Now, if (some of) the connecting morphisms of M' are non-zero on cohomology, it follows that the numerical dimension of P_m is strictly smaller than the dimension of the corresponding weight piece in $H^0(M)$ (i.e. of the part of $H^0(M)$ that comes from $H^m(P_m)$). The latter can only happen if $H^m(P_m) \neq 0$ and some $H^{m+1+2j}(P_m) \neq 0$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, it follows that the Sign Conjecture is not fulfilled for P_m (and hence for X).

Besides we obtain (using an argument of B. Kahn described in Proposition 3.18 of [21]) that either P_m is numerically zero or $P_m^{\chi(P_m)} \otimes \widehat{P_m}^{\chi(P_m)} \cong \mathbb{Q} \oplus T$ where T is a homological motif that is numerically zero whereas its étale cohomology is huge! Hence controlling such motives would allow to prove the Kunneth Conjecture.

Note lastly that $P_{m\pm1}$ are of different parity than P_m; it follows that they can only have non-zero cohomology in degrees $m + 1 + 2j$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore P_m can only have non-zero cohomology in degree m and in degrees $m + 1 + 2j$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, all other cohomologies of X were "cancelled" when we passed from M to M'; this yields the existence of the corresponding Kunneth projectors.

In seems probable that a similar reasoning could yield the standard Lefschetz Conjecture; see also Corollary 2.5.3 and Part 4 of Remark 2.4.3.

Remark 4.3.2. 1. Apriori the Kunneth projectors constructed by our method depend on the choice of l (in $Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$). Yet note that simple idempotents lifting arguments allows to express them in the terms of arbitrary lifts to $Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$ of Kunneth numerical projectors. It would follow that there exist elements of $Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}(P,P)$ that yield Kunneth projectors for all l simultaneously.

Alternatively, note that for $\operatorname{char} K = 0$ any set of Kunneth projectors for one l is automatically also a set of Kunneth projectors for all other l; this is the consequence of the comparison of the étale cohomology with the singular one.

2. Note that we have proved that the (weaker) Sign Conjecture implies the Kunneth Conjecture.

4.4 Divisible and homological motivic zeta functions of (smooth projective) varieties are rational

We recall some standard definitions of K_0-groups of categories (cf. §5.3 of [7] or 3.2.1 of [14]). We define the Grothendieck group of an additive category A as a group whose generators are of the form $[X]$, $X \in ObjA$; the relations are $[X \oplus Y] = [X] + [Y]$ for $X, Y \in ObjA$.

The K_0-group of a triangulated category T is defined as the group whose generators are $[t]$, $t \in ObjT$; if $A \to B \to C \to A[1]$ is a distinguished triangle then $[B] = [A] + [C]$. Note that $X \oplus 0 \cong X$ implies that $[X] = [Y]$ if $X \cong Y$ (in A or in T). Recall that (by Lemma 3 of 3.2.1 of [14]) if A is idempotent complete then $K_0(K_b(A))$ (defined this way) is isomorphic to $K_0(A)$ (via the embedding $A \to K^b(A)$).

It follows that there are natural homomorphisms $K_0(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}) \to K_0(\mathrm{Mot}^{\mathrm{eff}}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$ and $K_0(Chow\mathbb{Q}) \to K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$ (the category of not necessarily effective homological motives). All these groups nave natural compatible ring structures coming from the identity $(X,p)\otimes(Y,q) = (X\times Y, p\otimes q)$; here $X, Y \in SmPrVar$, p, q are idempotent morphisms of their motives.

We will denote the class of an element $X \in ObjA$ in $K_0(A)$ by $[X]$. We will denote by $K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow^{eff})$ (resp. $K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow)$) the factor of $K_0(Chow^{eff})$ (resp. $K_0(Chow)$) by (twisted) phantom classes. These groups are also commutative rings by part 3 of Remark 3.3.2.

Definition 4.4.1. 1. For $M \in ObjK^b(Chow\mathbb{Q})$ we define $\zeta_{\mathrm{Div}}(M,T) = \sum_{i\ge 0}[Sym^i(M)]t^i \in K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow\mathbb{Q})[[T]]$.

2. For $M \in ObjK^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$ we define $\zeta^{eff}_{\mathrm{Div}}(M,T)$ as the corresponding element of $K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})[[T]]$

Proposition 4.4.2. *For any $P \in ObjSmPrVar$ we have $\zeta^{eff}_{\mathrm{Div}}(M_{gm}(P),T) \in K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow\mathbb{Q}))(T)$.*

Proof. This easily follows from Theorem 4.1.5.

Indeed, as was shown in [15] (see Corollary 2 of §4), we have the Euler property for zeta-functions (in $K^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$) i.e. for a distinguished triangle $X \to Y \to Z$ we have $\zeta(Y,T) = \zeta(X,T)\zeta(Z,T)$. This is also true for ζ_{Div} since phantom classes form an ideal.

Hence it suffices to prove the statement for some class $C \subset ObjK^b(Chow^{eff})$ such that $M_{gm}(P) \subset \langle C\rangle$. Then we can take $C = t\mathbb{Q}(OM)$. Now, the zeta-function of any complex of motives Y could be presented as a (multiplicative) inverse to the series $\sum_{i\geq 0}(-T)^i Y^{\dot{i}}$; see (20) or [21] or Theorem 1 of [15] (along with the formula on page 4 of loc.cit).

Lastly, for $Y = t\mathbb{Q}(X)$, $X \in OM$ we have $\sum_{i\geq 0}(-T)^i Y^{\dot{i}} \in K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})[T]$ since $t\mathbb{Q}(X)$ is divisibly finite by part 1 of Theorem 4.1.5.

□

Remark 4.4.3. 1. Assertion 1 could also be deduced from 13.3.3.1 of [1].

2. Certainly, Proposition 4.4.2 is also valid for any $X \in ObjK^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$ that is isomorphic to a complex of P_i : $P_i \in SmPrVar$ i.e. for objects of a dense subcategory of $K^b(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q})$.

Since we are interested in the K_0-group, in the following statement we will sometimes ignore even shifts.

Theorem 4.4.4. *1. For any $P \in SmPrVar$ we have $\zeta_{hom}(M,T) \in K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})(T)$.*

2. Besides, for P (equidimensional) of dimension m we have a functional equation

$$\zeta_{hom}(M_{gm}(P),t^{-1}) = \det(P)(-T)^{\chi(P)}\zeta_{hom}(M_{gm}(P),T(-m)), \qquad (17)$$

where $\det(P)$ is the class of certain $\otimes$-invertible element of $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$, $(-m)$ denotes tensoring by $[\mathbb{Q}(-m)[-2m]]$.

Proof. 1. Immediate from Proposition 4.4.2 since Proposition 3.3.3 yields the existence of a homomorphism $K_{0\,\mathrm{Div}}(Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}) \to K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\,\mathbb{Q})$.

2. It suffices to check that for any $M \in \langle t(OM)\rangle$ we have

$$\zeta_{hom}(M^*,t^{-1}) = \det(M)(-T)^{\chi(M)}\zeta_{hom}(M,T) \qquad (18)$$

Here M^* is the Poincare dual of M, $\det M$ is a class of certain invertible element of $K^b(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q})$.

Indeed, we have $M_{gm}(P)^* = P(-m)[-2m]$, hence $\zeta_{hom}(M_{gm}(P)^*,t^{-1}) = \zeta_{hom}(M_{gm}(P)(-l),t^{-1}) = \zeta(M_{gm}(P),t^{-1}(-d))$; see Theorem 2 of [23].

Next, since $\chi(M)$ is an Euler characteristics for DM_{gm}^{eff} (i.e. i.e. for a distinguished triangle $X \to Y \to Z$ we have $\chi(Y) = \chi(X) + \chi(Z)$); it suffices to verify (18) for $t(X) :\ X \in OM$. In this case one can immediately apply the proof of Theorem 1 of [23] (recall that our case is "even" so the first part of the proof of loc. cit. already yields the result). Note that in this case we can put $\chi(M)$ for the dimension of M (which participated in the functional equation of Kahn) by part 3 of Theorem 4.1.5.

□

Remark 4.4.5. We also obtain that $\det(P)$ could be calculated as the alternated tensor product of $[t_{hom}\mathbb{Q}(M_{rs}[s-r-m])^{\chi(M_{rs}[s-r-m])}]$; see Definition 2 of [23]. Here M_{rs} are the motives considered in the proof of Part II of Proposition 3.2.3.

2. One could obtain even more information on $\det(P)$ numerically; cf. Theorem 4.2.1 and its proof.

Note also that if the Sign Conjecture is valid for homological (resp. Chow) motives (i.e. all homological (resp. Chow) motives with rational coefficients are Kimura-finite) then the obvious projection $K_0(Chow\mathbb{Q}) \to K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}})$ (resp. $K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{hom}}\mathbb{Q}) \to K_0(\mathrm{Mot}_{\mathrm{num}})$) is an isomorphism.

5 The case of finite K

In the case when K is finite we can use Frobenius in order to decompose obvious motives into "pure" pieces. Recall that we denote the characteristic of K by p. This easily implies that the action of Frobenius on any motif is finite-dimensional (modulo divisible morphisms). It follows that one can lift the Kunneth decomposition of the diagonal (constructed via the Frobenius) to $Chow^{eff}$ "modulo divisible morphisms". We also obtain certain bounds on the exponent of $H_{s,v}^{mot,i}(P)$ (that do not depend on v) for $P \in SmPrVar$, $i < 2s-1$. This yields a bound on the exponent of the i-th Quillen K-groups of P with $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients for $i > 1$ (the bound does not depend on $v :\ (v,p) = 1$).

We will denote the (geometric) Frobenius corresponding to the finite base field considered by F.

Throughout the section we use the fact that F commutes with all morphisms (of motives). $F_M : M \to M$ will denote the Frobenius of M (for a motif M).

We denote $\#K$ by q.

5.1 The action of Frobenius on any motif is divisibly finite-dimensional

We will call a unitary $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ a *polynomial of weight* $\le m$ if its roots are Weil numbers of weight $\le m$ with respect to K (i.e. we demand all of their modules to equal $q^{r_i/2}$ for some $r_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $0 \le r_i \le m$ for any embedding of $\mathbb{Q}^{alg}$ into $\mathbb{C}$).

Proposition 5.1.1. *For any $V \in SmPrVar$ there exists a unitary $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of weight $\le 2\dim V$ such that $P(F) : V \to V$ is divisible as a morphism of Chow motives.*

Proof. By (14) if $X \in OM$ the morphism $P_{H^0(X)}(F_X) : X \to X$ is divisible; here $P_{H^0(X)}$ is the characteristic polynomial for Frobenius on $H^0(X)$. Here we use the fact that $P_{H^0(X)}$ does not depend on X since H^0 is the only cohomology of X.

Therefore a similar statement (for some weight restriction) is valid for $t(X)$ if $X \in OM$.

Applying Jouanolou's trick (see the end of §1.1) we obtain that it suffices to verify the following statement.

Let $X = Y \setminus Z$, Y is smooth projective, Z is its smooth hyperplane section. Then there exists a unitary polynomial P of weight $\le \dim X + 1$ such that $P(F)$ is zero $t(M_{gm}(X))$. In the case when X is some *Jouanolou's replacement* of some $V \in SmPrVar$ we may take P of weights $\le \dim X$.

Note that have $\dim X = 2\dim V$. We prove the (latter) statement by the induction on $m = \dim X$. The case $m = 0$ is obvious.

By the same Bertini-type argument as mentioned in the proof of part II of Proposition 3.2.3, there exists a smooth hyperplane section Y' of Y such that $Z' = Z \cap Y'$ is also smooth. We denote $X' = Y' \setminus Z'$ and consider $M = M_{gm}(X') \to M_{gm}(X)$. We have $M \in OM[m]$ by part I5 of Proposition 3.2.3. Besides, $t(M) = Y'[-1] \to Y[-1] \oplus Z'(1)[1] \to Z(1)[1]$. By the inductive assumption there exists a unitary $P' \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ of weight $\le m$ such that $P'(F_{t(X')})$ is divisible.

We have an obvious morphism $M_{gm}(X) \to M$. Next, note that it suffices to construct a unitary $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ such that $P(F_{t(X)})$ becomes zero in the category $K^b(Chow \otimes (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}))$ (we tensor morphisms in Chow by $(\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z})$) for **all** l, n.

In $K^b(Chow \otimes (\mathbb{Z}/l^n\mathbb{Z}))$ we have $P'(F) \circ h = 0$ where h is the natural morphism $t_{l^n}(M) \to t_{l^n}(M_{gm}(X'))[1]$, t_{l^n} is the corresponding weight complex functor. It follows that $P'(F)_{t_{l^n}(M_{gm}(X))} : t_{l^n}(M_{gm}(X)) \to t_{l^n}(M_{gm}(X))$ could be factorized through $t_{l^n}(M)$. Since $P_{H^m(M)}(F_M)$ is zero modulo l^n for all l, n, we obtain that $P_{H^m(M)}(F_M)P'(F)$ is divisible on $t(M_{gm}(X))$. Lastly,

Deligne's purity (for étale cohomology) easily implies that $P_{H^m(M)}$ is of weight $\leq m+1$; see Lemma 5.2.1 below. The lemma also yields that it is of weights $\leq m$ if X is a Jouanolou's replacement for some smooth projective V.

□

Remark 5.1.2. 1. Instead of applying Jouanolou's trick we could have considered motives similar to those in the proof of Part II of Proposition 3.2.3. Yet it seems that this way would lead to a polynomial P of larger degree. Note also: unfortunately, the estimate on the degree of P that we obtain (using either way of the proof) depends on the dimensions of cohomology of certain obvious motives. It seems that getting a nice bound for the latter is a non-trivial problem. Yet see part 2 of Remark 5.2.3 (below).

On the other hand, the result we obtained is "integral"; therefore it does not follow from the "standard" motivic conjectures (see part 1 of Remark 3.2.4).

2. Proposition 5.1.1 immediately implies similar results for $Chow^{eff}$ and $K^b(Chow^{eff})$. Next, one could easily check that if $X \in ObjDM^{pr}$, $t(X) = P_0 \to \dots P_i$, for $f \in DM^{pr}(X,X)$ the morphism $t(f)$ is divisible, then f^{i+1} is divisible also. The proof is similar to those of part II of Theorem 3.3.1 of [7] (it was proved there that $t(f)=0 \implies f^{i+1}=0$). Hence we can extend Proposition 5.1.1 to all objects of DM^{pr}.

3. The decomposition of P_V into $2\dim V+1$ multipliers of different weights easily yields $2\dim V+1$ idempotents in the ring $\mathbb{Q}[T]/(P_V(T))$. It follows that the Kunneth projectors of V could be lifted to $Chow^{eff}\mathbb{Q}$ "modulo divisible morphisms".

4. Both the "Jouanolou" method of the proof used above and the method proof of Part II of Proposition 3.2.3 could be applied over an arbitrary K for F being an endomorphism satisfying: the restrictions of F on the pieces of a certain stratification of V (or X) should induce endomorphisms of these pieces. Unfortunately, this condition seems to be rather restrictive.

Here in order to pass from endomorphisms of motives to endomorphisms of their weight complexes and vice versa one should use part 1 of Proposition 3.1.1.

5.2 Bounding the exponents of certain motivic cohomology groups

We will say that the weights of a unitary $P \in \mathbb{Z}[T]$ with weights $\leq m$ are concentrated in $[n,m]$ for $n \leq m$ if for any embedding of $\mathbb{Q}^{alg}$ into $\mathbb{C}$ the modules of its roots equal $q^{r_i/2}$ for some $n \leq r_i \leq m$.

Lemma 5.2.1. *The weights of the polynomial $P_{H^m(M)}$ that was considered in the proof of Proposition 5.1.1 are concentrated in $[m-1, m+1]$. They are also concentrated in degrees $[m-1, m]$ if X a Jouanolou's replacement for some $V \in SmPrVar$ (see the end of §1.1).*

Proof. Indeed, we have a half-exact sequence $H^{alg,et_{m-1}}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X') \to H^{alg,et_m}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(M) \to H^{alg,et_m}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X)$. Therefore it order to prove the first assertion suffices to prove that the weights of $P_{H^m(X)}$ are concentrated in $[m, m+1]$ whereas the weights of $P_{H^{m-1}(X)}$ are concentrated in $[m-1, m]$. The former statement is obvious from the half-exact (Gysin) sequence $H^{alg,et_m}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(Y) \to H^{alg,et_m}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(X) \to H^{alg,et_{m-1}}_{\mathbb{Q}_l}(Z(1))$ and Deligne's purity; the second statement is proved similarly.

The second assertion now follows easily since in this case $H^m(X) \cong H^m(V)$.

□

Now we bound the exponent of certain torsion motivic cohomology groups of smooth projective varieties. We will consider all $v \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(v, p) = 1$. Recall that $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(V) = \{0\}$ if $i < 0$ or $i > 2s$.

Proposition 5.2.2. *Let $V \in SmPrVar$, $s \geq 0$, $i < 2s-1$. Then for there exists a bound on the exponent of $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(V)$ that does not depend on v.*

Proof. Applying our Weak Lefschetz result (i.e. part 2 of Theorem 2.4.2) we reduce the statement to the case $i \geq \dim V$.

Now we argue as in the proof of Proposition 5.1.1.

We obtain that the statement could be reduced to the following one. Let $X = Y \backslash Z$, Y is smooth projective of dimension m, Z is its smooth hyperplane section. Then for $m < 2s-1$ there exists a bound on the exponent of $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(X)$ that does not depend on v. We prove this statement by induction in m. In the case $V = \varnothing$ the statement is obvious.

We consider M and X' as in the proof of Proposition 5.1.1. By the inductive assumption, the statement is valid for X'. We have a half-exact sequence $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(M) \to H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(X) \to H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(X')$. By the inductive assumption the constant required exists for $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(X')$. Hence it suffices to provide some constant for $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(M)$.

As noted in the proof of Proposition 5.1.1, there exists a polynomial $P_M \in Z[T]$ such that $P_M(F)$ is divisible. On the other hand, F acts as $\times q^s$ on $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}(s)$. We obtain that $H^{mot,i}_{s,v}(M)$ is annihilated by $P_M(q^s)$. It remains to note that $P(q^s)$ is non-zero since the weights of $P(F)_M$ are concentrated in $[m-1, m+1]$.

□

Remark 5.2.3. 1. In particular, we obtain that $\mathrm{CoDiv}(H_s^{mot,i}(V))$ is of finite exponent for $i \neq 2s,\ 2s-1$.

Applying duality we deduce that $\mathrm{CoDiv}\, DM_{gm}^{eff}(X, Y[i])$ is of finite exponent if $X, Y \in ObjChow^{eff} \subset ObjDM_{gm}^{eff}$, $i < -1$. Note also that in this case $DM_{gm}^{eff}(X, Y[i]) = \{0\}$ for $i > 0$.

Besides, for l large enough the groups $H_{l^n}^{moti}{}_s(V)$ vanish (for all $n > 0$ and $i < 2s-1$).

2. The proof shows that the constant required could be obtained by multiplying $P_{M_i}(q^s)$ for certain obvious P_i. Note that the latter could be easily expressed in terms of number of points of the corresponding Y_i, Z_i, Y_i', Z_i' over extensions of K of degree $\leq 2s$.

This statement is also true for $i = 2s-1$ and $i = 2s$; the question is whether all $P_{M_i}(q^s) \neq 0$! This depends on the cohomology of V and of the subvarieties of the corresponding X (for some choice of a suitable stratification).

3. Using the well-known spectral sequence we immediately obtain a bound on $K_{i,v}(V)$ (the K_i-group with $\mathbb{Z}/v\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients) for $i > 1$. Note that the well-known Beilnson-Parshin Conjecture only predicts that the K_i (with $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients) are torsion in this case without saying anything about the exponent.

Note also that K_0 and K_1 are much easier for understanding than the higher K-groups. In particular, they are finitely generated.

4. Lastly by (12), Proposition 5.2.2 yields a bound on the torsion of $H^{mot,i}(V)$ for all $i \leq 2s-1$.

References

[1] Andre Y. Une introduction aux motifs (motifs purs, motifs mixtes, periodes), vol. 17 of Panoramas et Syntheses, Societe Mathematique de France, Paris, 2004.

[2] Andre Y., Kahn B. Nilpotence, radicaux et structures monoi"dales// Rendiconti del Seminario Matematico dell'Universita' di Padova 108 (2002), 107–291.

[3] Intermediate Jacobians and Hodge Structures of Moduli Spaces, Arapura D., Sastry P. // Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math Sci.), vol. 110, No. 1, 2000, 1–26; see http://www.ias.ac.in/mathsci/vol110/feb2000/Pm1709.pdf

[4] Beilinson A., On the derived category of perverse sheaves, in: K-theory, Arithmetic and Geometry, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1289, Springer, 1987, 27–41.

[5] Beilinson A., Vologodsky V. A guide to Voevodsky's motives, electronic, available on http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0604004

[6] Bloch S., Ogus A. Gersten's conjecture and the homology of schemes// Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Sup. v.7 (1994), 181–202.

[7] Bondarko M., Weight structures, weight filtrations, weight spectral sequences, and weight complexes for triangulated categories (including motives and spectra), electronic, http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003

[8] Bondarko M.V., Differential graded motives: weight complex, weight filtrations and spectral sequences for realizations; Voevodsky vs. Hanamura, electronic, http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0601713

[9] Bondarko M.V. Explicit generators for (conjectural) mixed motives (in Voevodsky's DM_{gm}^{eff}). The Kunneth decomposition of pure (numerical) motives, electronic, http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0703499

[10] Deglise F. Around the Gysin triangle, available on the K-theory preprint archive, no 764, http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0764/

[11] de Jong A. J. Smoothness, semi-stability and alterations// Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci. Publ. Math. No. 83 (1996), 51–93.

[12] Deligne P. Expose XVIII de Séminaire de Géométrie Algébrique du Bois-Marie 1963-64, Theorie des topos et cohomologie etale des schemas (SGA 4; Lecture Notes in Math. 305).

[13] Gelfand S., Manin Yu., Methods of homological algebra. 2nd ed. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. xx+372 pp.

[14] Gillet H., Soulé C. Descent, motives and K-theory// J. reine und angew. Math. 478, 1996, 127–176.

[15] Guletskii V., Zeta functions in triangulated categories, electronic, http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0605040.

[16] Hanamura M. Mixed motives and algebraic cycles, III// Math. Res. Letters 6, 1999, 61–82.

[17] Huber A. Realizations of Voevodsky's motives// J. Alg. Geometry, 9 (2000), no. 4, 755–799.

[18] Huber A. Mixed motives and their realizations in derived categories. Lecture notes in mathematics, Vol. 1604, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1995.

[19] Huber A., Kahn B. The slice filtration and mixed Tate motives, preprint, available on the K-theory preprint archive, no 719, http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0719/

[20] Ivorra F. Realisation l-adique des motifs triangules geometriques I, preprint, available on the K-theory preprint archive, no 762, http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0762/

[21] Ivorra F. Finite dimensional motives and applications (following S-I. Kimura, P. O'Sullivan and others), preprint, available at www.institut.math.jussieu.fr/~fivorra/SurveyIHES.pdf

[22] Jannsen U., Motives, numerical equivalence, and semi-simplicity //Inv. Math., vol. 107 (1992), 447–452.

[23] Kahn B. Motivic zeta functions of motives, electronic, http://www.arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0606424.

[24] Kimura S.-I., Chow motives are finite-dimensional, in some sense// Math. Ann. 331 (2005), 173Ű-201.

[25] Mazza C. Schur functors and motives// K-Theory 33 (2004), 89–106.

[26] Poonen B. Bertini theorems over finite fields// Annals of mathematics, vol. 160, no. 3, 2004, 1099–1127.

[27] Suslin A., Voevodsky V. Bloch-Kato conjecture and motivic cohomology with finite coefficients, The Arithmetic and Geometry of Algebraic Cycles (Banff, AB, 1998), NATO Sci. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., vol. 548, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2000, 117–189.

[28] Voevodsky V. Triangulated category of motives, in: Voevodsky V., Suslin A., and Friedlander E., Cycles, transfers and motivic homology theories, Annals of Mathematical studies, vol. 143, Princeton University Press, 2000, 188–238, see also http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0074/

[29] Voevodsky V. Cohomological theory of presheaves with transfers, same volume, 87–137.

[30] Voevodsky V. Motivic Cohomology with $\mathbb{Z}/2$-coefficients, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., vol. 98 (2003), no. 1, 59–104.

[31] Voevodsky V., A letter to Beilinson, December 6, 1992, available at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0033/

[32] Voevodsky V., A nilpotence theorem for cycles algebraically equivalent to zero// Int. Math. Res. Notices, 1995, 187–199.