

# HALVES OF POINTS OF AN ODD DEGREE HYPERELLIPTIC CURVE IN ITS JACOBIAN

YURI G. ZARHIN

ABSTRACT. Let  $f(x)$  be a degree  $(2g+1)$  monic polynomial with coefficients in an algebraically closed field  $K$  with  $\text{char}(K) \neq 2$  and without repeated roots. Let  $\mathfrak{R} \subset K$  be the  $(2g+1)$ -element set of roots of  $f(x)$ . Let  $\mathcal{C} : y^2 = f(x)$  be an odd degree genus  $g$  hyperelliptic curve over  $K$ . Let  $J$  be the jacobian of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $J[2] \subset J(K)$  the (sub)group of points of order dividing 2. We identify  $\mathcal{C}$  with the image of its canonical embedding into  $J$  (the infinite point of  $\mathcal{C}$  goes to the identity element of  $J$ ). Let  $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$  and

$$M_{1/2, P} = \{\mathfrak{a} \in J(K) \mid 2\mathfrak{a} = P\} \subset J(K),$$

which is  $J[2]$ -torsor. In a previous work we established an explicit bijection between the sets  $M_{1/2, P}$  and

$$\mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P} := \{\tau : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow K \mid \tau(\alpha)^2 = a - \alpha \ \forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{R}; \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} \tau(\alpha) = -b\}.$$

The aim of this paper is to describe the induced action of  $J[2]$  on  $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$  (i.e., how signs of square roots  $r(\alpha) = \sqrt{a - \alpha}$  should change).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $K$  be an algebraically closed field of characteristic different from 2,  $g$  a positive integer,  $\mathfrak{R} \subset K$  a  $(2g+1)$ -element set,

$$f(x) = f_{\mathfrak{R}}(x) := \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} (x - \alpha)$$

a degree  $(2g+1)$  polynomial with coefficients in  $K$  and without repeated roots,  $\mathcal{C} : y^2 = f(x)$  the corresponding genus  $g$  hyperelliptic curve over  $K$ , and  $J$  the jacobian of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We identify  $\mathcal{C}$  with the image of its canonical embedding

$$\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow J, P \mapsto \text{cl}((P) - (\infty))$$

into  $J$  (the infinite point  $\infty$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  goes to the identity element of  $J$ ). Let  $J[2] \subset J(K)$  be the kernel of multiplication by 2 in  $J(K)$ , which is a  $2g$ -dimensional  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -vector space. All the  $(2g+1)$  points

$$\mathfrak{W}_{\alpha} := (\alpha, 0) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K) \ (\alpha \in \mathfrak{R})$$

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14H40, 14G27, 11G10.

*Key words and phrases.* Hyperelliptic curves, jacobians, Mumford representations.

Partially supported by Simons Foundation Collaboration grant # 585711.

This paper was started during my stay in May-July 2018 at the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik (Bonn, Germany), whose hospitality and support are gratefully acknowledged.

lie in  $J[2]$  and generate it as the  $2g$ -dimensional  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -vector space; they satisfy the only relation

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathfrak{W}_\alpha = 0 \in J[2] \subset J(K).$$

This leads to a well known canonical isomorphism [4] between  $\mathbb{F}_2$ -vector spaces  $J[2]$  and

$$(\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0 = \left\{ \phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2 \mid \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \phi(\alpha) = 0 \right\}.$$

Namely, each function  $\phi \in (\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0$  corresponds to

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \phi(\alpha) \mathfrak{W}_\alpha \in J[2].$$

For example, for each  $\beta \in \mathfrak{A}$  the point  $\mathfrak{W}_\beta = \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  corresponds to the function  $\psi_\beta : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  that sends  $\beta$  to 0 and all other elements of  $\mathfrak{A}$  to 1.

If  $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$  then the finite set

$$M_{1/2, \mathfrak{b}} := \{ \mathfrak{a} \in J(K) \mid 2\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b} \} \subset J(K)$$

consists of  $2^{2g}$  elements and carries the natural structure of a  $J[2]$ -torsor.

Let

$$P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K).$$

Let us consider, the set

$$\mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P} := \left\{ \mathfrak{r} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow K \mid \mathfrak{r}(\alpha)^2 = a - \alpha \ \forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{A}; \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{A}} \mathfrak{r}(\alpha) = -b \right\}.$$

Changes of signs in the (even number of) square roots provide  $\mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P}$  with the natural structure of a  $(\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0$ -torsor. Namely, let

$$\chi : \mathbb{F}_2 \rightarrow K^*$$

be the **additive character** such that

$$\chi(0) = 1, \chi(1) = -1.$$

Then the result of the action of a function  $\phi : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  from  $(\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0$  on  $\mathfrak{r} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow K$  from  $\mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P}$  is just the product

$$\chi(\phi) \mathfrak{r} : \mathfrak{A} \rightarrow K, \ \alpha \mapsto \chi(\phi(\alpha)) \mathfrak{r}(\alpha).$$

On the other hand, I constructed in [9] an explicit *bijection* of finite sets

$$\mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P} \cong M_{1/2, P}, \ \mathfrak{r} \mapsto \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in M_{1/2, P} \subset J(K).$$

Identifying (as above)  $J[2]$  and  $(\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0$ , we obtain a second structure of a  $(\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{A}})^0$ -torsor on  $\mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P}$ . Our main result asserts that these two structures actually coincide. In down-to-earth terms this means the following.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P}$  and  $\beta \in \mathfrak{A}$ . Let us define  $\mathfrak{r}^\beta \in \mathfrak{A}_{1/2, P}$  as follows.*

$$\mathfrak{r}^\beta(\beta) = \mathfrak{r}(\beta), \ \mathfrak{r}^\beta(\alpha) = -\mathfrak{r}(\alpha) \ \forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{A} \setminus \{\beta\}.$$

*Then*

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}^\beta} = \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} + \mathfrak{W}_\beta = \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} + \left( \sum_{\alpha \neq \beta} \mathfrak{W}_\alpha \right).$$

**Remark 1.2.** In the case of elliptic curves (i.e., when  $g = 1$ ) the assertion of Theorem 1.1 was proven in [2, Th. 2.3(iv)].

**Example 1.3.** If  $P = \mathfrak{W}_\beta = (\beta, 0)$  then

$$\mathfrak{a}_\tau + \mathfrak{W}_\beta = \mathfrak{a}_\tau - \mathfrak{W}_\beta = \mathfrak{a}_\tau - 2\mathfrak{a}_\tau = -\mathfrak{a}_\tau$$

while

$$-\mathfrak{a}_\tau = \mathfrak{a}_{-\tau}$$

(see [9, Remark 3.5]). On the other hand,  $\tau(\beta) = \sqrt{\beta - \beta} = 0$  for all  $\tau$  and

$$\tau^\beta = -\tau : \alpha \mapsto -\tau(\alpha) \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathfrak{R}.$$

This implies that

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\tau^\beta} = \mathfrak{a}_{-\tau} = \mathfrak{a}_\tau + \mathfrak{W}_\beta.$$

This proves Theorem 1.1 in the special case  $P = \mathfrak{W}_\beta$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall basic facts about Mumford representations of points of  $J(K)$  and review results of [9], including an explicit description of the bijection between  $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$  and  $M_{1/2,P}$ . In Section 3 we give explicit formulas for the Mumford representation of  $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{W}_\beta$  when  $\mathfrak{a}$  lies neither on the theta divisor of  $J$  nor on its translation by  $\mathfrak{W}_\beta$ , assuming that we know the Mumford representation of  $\mathfrak{a}$ . In Section 4 we prove Theorem 1.1, using auxiliary results from commutative algebra that are proven in Section 5.

## 2. HALVES AND SQUARE ROOTS

Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be the smooth projective model of the smooth affine plane  $K$ -curve

$$y^2 = f(x) = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} (x - \alpha)$$

where  $\mathfrak{R}$  is a  $(2g + 1)$ -element subset of  $K$ . In particular,  $f(x)$  is a monic degree  $(2g + 1)$  polynomial without repeated roots. It is well known that  $\mathcal{C}$  is a genus  $g$  hyperelliptic curve over  $K$  with precisely one *infinite* point, which we denote by  $\infty$ . In other words,

$$\mathcal{C}(K) = \{(a, b) \in K^2 \mid b^2 = \prod_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} (a - \alpha_i)\} \sqcup \{\infty\}.$$

Clearly,  $x$  and  $y$  are nonconstant rational functions on  $\mathcal{C}$ , whose only pole is  $\infty$ . More precisely, the polar divisor of  $x$  is  $2(\infty)$  and the polar divisor of  $y$  is  $(2g+1)(\infty)$ . The zero divisor of  $y$  is  $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} (\mathfrak{W}_\alpha)$ . In particular,  $y$  is a *local parameter* at (every)  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ .

We write  $\iota$  for the hyperelliptic involution

$$\iota : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}, (x, y) \mapsto (x, -y), \quad \infty \mapsto \infty.$$

The set of fixed points of  $\iota$  consists of  $\infty$  and all  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  ( $\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}$ ). It is well known that for each  $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  the divisor  $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$  is principal. More precisely, if  $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  then  $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$  is the divisor of the rational function  $x - a$  on  $\mathcal{C}$ . In particular, if  $P = \mathfrak{W}_\alpha = (\alpha, 0)$  then

$$2(\mathfrak{W}_\alpha) - 2(\infty) = \text{div}(x - \alpha).$$

In particular,  $x - \alpha$  has a double zero at  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  (and no other zeros). If  $D$  is a divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$  then we write  $\text{supp}(D)$  for its *support*, which is a finite subset of  $\mathcal{C}(K)$ .

Recall that the jacobian  $J$  of  $\mathcal{C}$  is a  $g$ -dimensional abelian variety over  $K$ . If  $D$  is a degree zero divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$  then we write  $\text{cl}(D)$  for its linear equivalence class, which is viewed as an element of  $J(K)$ . Elements of  $J(K)$  may be described in terms of so called **Mumford representations** (see [4, Sect. 3.12], [8, Sect. 13.2] and Subsection 2.3 below).

We will identify  $\mathcal{C}$  with its image in  $J$  with respect to the canonical regular map  $\mathcal{C} \hookrightarrow J$  under which  $\infty$  goes to the identity element of  $J$ . In other words, a point  $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  is identified with  $\text{cl}((P) - (\infty)) \in J(K)$ . Then the action of the hyperelliptic involution  $\iota$  on  $\mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$  coincides with multiplication by  $-1$  on  $J(K)$ . In particular, the list of points of order 2 on  $\mathcal{C}$  consists of all  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  ( $\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}$ ).

**2.1.** Since  $K$  is algebraically closed, the commutative group  $J(K)$  is divisible. It is well known that for each  $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$  there are exactly  $2^{2g}$  elements  $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$  such that  $2\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$ . In [9] we established explicitly the following bijection  $\mathfrak{r} \mapsto \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$  between the  $2^{2g}$ -element sets  $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$  and  $M_{1/2,P}$ .

If  $\mathfrak{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$  then for each positive integer  $i \leq 2g+1$  let us consider  $\mathfrak{s}_i(\mathfrak{r}) \in K$  defined as the value of  $i$ th basic symmetric function at  $(2g+1)$  elements  $\{\mathfrak{r}(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in \mathfrak{R}\}$  (notice that all  $\mathfrak{r}(\alpha)$  are distinct, since their squares  $\mathfrak{r}(\alpha)^2 = a - \alpha$  are distinct). Let us consider the degree  $g$  monic polynomial

$$U_\mathfrak{r}(x) = (-1)^g \left[ (a-x)^g + \sum_{j=1}^g \mathfrak{s}_{2j}(\mathfrak{r})(a-x)^{g-j} \right],$$

and the polynomial

$$V_\mathfrak{r}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^g (\mathfrak{s}_{2j+1}(\mathfrak{r}) - \mathfrak{s}_1(\mathfrak{r})\mathfrak{s}_{2j}(\mathfrak{r})) (a-x)^{g-j}$$

whose degree is *strictly less* than  $g$ . Let  $\{c_1, \dots, c_g\} \subset K$  be the collection of all  $g$  roots of  $U_\mathfrak{r}(x)$ , i.e.,

$$U_\mathfrak{r}(x) = \prod_{j=1}^g (x - c_j) \in K[x].$$

Let us put

$$d_j = V_\mathfrak{r}(c_j) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, g.$$

It is proven in [9, Th. 3.2] that  $Q_j = (c_j, d_j)$  lies in  $\mathcal{C}(K)$  for all  $j$  and

$$\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} := \text{cl} \left( \left( \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j) \right) - g(\infty) \right) \in J(K)$$

satisfies  $2\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} = P$ , i.e.,  $\mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r} \in M_{1/2,P}$ . In addition, **none of  $Q_j$  coincides with any  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$** , i.e.,

$$U_\mathfrak{r}(\alpha) \neq 0, \quad c_j \neq \alpha, \quad d_j \neq 0.$$

The main result of [9] asserts that the map

$$\mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P} \rightarrow M_{1/2,P}, \quad \mathfrak{r} \mapsto \mathfrak{a}_\mathfrak{r}$$

is a **bijection**.

**Remark 2.2.** Notice that one may express explicitly  $\mathfrak{r}$  in terms of  $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$  and  $V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ . Namely [9, Th. 3.2], *none* of  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}$  is a root of  $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$  and

$$(1) \quad \mathfrak{r}(\alpha) = \mathfrak{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\alpha)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\alpha)} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \mathfrak{R}.$$

In order to determine  $\mathfrak{s}_1(\mathfrak{r})$ , let us fix two *distinct* roots  $\beta, \gamma \in \mathfrak{R}$ . Then [9, Cor. 3.4]

$$\frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)} \neq \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)}$$

and

$$(2) \quad \mathfrak{s}_1(\mathfrak{r}) = \frac{(-1)^g}{2} \times \frac{\left( \beta + \left( \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)} \right)^2 \right) - \left( \gamma + \left( \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)} \right)^2 \right)}{\frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\gamma)} - \frac{V_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)}{U_{\mathfrak{r}}(\beta)}}.$$

**2.3. Mumford representations** (see [4, Sect. 3.12], [8, Sect. 13.2, pp. 411–415, especially, Prop. 13.4, Th. 13.5 and Th. 13.7]). Recall [8, Sect. 13.2, p. 411] that if  $D$  is an effective divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$  of (nonnegative) degree  $m$ , whose support does *not* contain  $\infty$ , then the degree zero divisor  $D - m(\infty)$  is called *semi-reduced* if it enjoys the following properties.

- If  $\mathfrak{W}_{\alpha}$  lies in  $\text{supp}(D)$  then it appears in  $D$  with multiplicity 1.
- If a point  $Q$  of  $\mathcal{C}(K)$  lies in  $\text{supp}(D)$  and does not coincide with any of  $\mathfrak{W}_{\alpha}$  then  $\iota(Q)$  does *not* lie in  $\text{supp}(D)$ .

If, in addition,  $m \leq g$  then  $D - m(\infty)$  is called *reduced*.

It is known ([4, Ch. 3a], [8, Sect. 13.2, Prop. 3.6 on p. 413]) that for each  $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$  there exist *exactly one* nonnegative  $m$  and (effective) degree  $m$  divisor  $D$  such that the degree zero divisor  $D - m(\infty)$  is *reduced* and  $\text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}$ . If

$$m \geq 1, D = \sum_{j=1}^m (Q_j) \text{ where } Q_j = (a_j, b_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, m$$

(here  $Q_j$  do *not* have to be distinct) then the corresponding

$$\mathfrak{a} = \text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \sum_{j=1}^m Q_j \in J(K).$$

The *Mumford representation* of  $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$  is the pair  $(U(x), V(x))$  of polynomials  $U(x), V(x) \in K[x]$  such that

$$U(x) = \prod_{j=1}^m (x - a_j)$$

is a degree  $m$  monic polynomial while  $V(x)$  has degree  $< m = \deg(U)$ , the polynomial  $V(x)^2 - f(x)$  is divisible by  $U(x)$ , and

$$b_j = V(a_j), Q_j = (a_j, V(a_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, m.$$

(Here  $(a_j, b_j)$  are as above.) Such a pair always exists, is unique, and (as we have just seen) uniquely determines not only  $\mathfrak{a}$  but also divisors  $D$  and  $D - m(\infty)$ .

Conversely, if  $U(x)$  is a monic polynomial of degree  $m \leq g$  and  $V(x)$  a polynomial such that  $\deg(V) < \deg(U)$  and  $V(x)^2 - f(x)$  is divisible by  $U(x)$  then there exists exactly one  $\mathfrak{a} = \text{cl}(D - m(\infty))$  where  $D - m(\infty)$  is a reduced divisor and  $(U(x), V(x))$  is the Mumford representation of  $\mathfrak{a} = \text{cl}(D - m(\infty))$ .

**2.4.** In the notation of Subsect. 2.1, let us consider the effective degree  $g$  divisor

$$D_\tau := \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j)$$

on  $\mathcal{C}$ . Then  $\text{supp}(D_\tau)$  (obviously) does contain neither  $\infty$  nor any of  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ 's. It is proven in [9, Th. 3.2] that the divisor  $D_\tau - g(\infty)$  is reduced and the pair  $(U_\tau(x), V_\tau(x))$  is the Mumford representation of

$$\mathfrak{a}_\tau := \text{cl}(D_\tau - g(\infty)).$$

In particular, if  $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  lies in  $\text{supp}(D)$  (i.e., is one of  $Q_j$ 's) then  $\iota(Q)$  does not.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $D$  be an effective divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$  of degree  $m > 0$  such that  $m \leq 2g+1$  and  $\text{supp}(D)$  does not contain  $\infty$ . Assume that the divisor  $D - m(\infty)$  is principal.*

- (1) *Suppose that  $m$  is odd. Then:*
  - (i)  *$m = 2g + 1$  and there exists exactly one polynomial  $v(x) \in K[x]$  such that the divisor of  $y - v(x)$  coincides with  $D - (2g+1)(\infty)$ . In addition,  $\deg(v) \leq g$ .*
  - (ii) *If  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  lies in  $\text{supp}(D)$  then it appears in  $D$  with multiplicity 1.*
  - (iii) *If  $b$  is a nonzero element of  $K$  and  $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  lies in  $\text{supp}(D)$  then  $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$  does not lie in  $\text{supp}(D)$ .*
  - (iv)  *$D - (2g + 1)(\infty)$  is semi-reduced (but not reduced).*
- (2) *Suppose that  $m = 2d$  is even. Then:*
  - (i) *there exists exactly one monic degree  $d$  polynomial  $u(x) \in K[x]$  such that the divisor of  $u(x)$  coincides with  $D - m(\infty)$ ;*
  - (ii) *every point  $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  appears in  $D - m(\infty)$  with the same multiplicity as  $\iota(Q)$ ;*
  - (iii) *every  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  appears in  $D - m(\infty)$  with even multiplicity.*

*Proof.* All the assertions except (2)(iii) are already proven in [9, Lemma 2.2]. In order to prove the remaining one, let us split the polynomial  $v(x)$  into a product  $v(x) = (x - \alpha)^d v_1(x)$  where  $d$  is a nonnegative integer and  $v_1(x) \in K[x]$  satisfies  $v_1(\alpha) \neq 0$ . Then  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$  appears in  $D - m(\infty)$  with multiplicity  $2d$ , because  $(x - \alpha)$  has a double zero at  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ . (See also [5].)  $\square$

Let  $d \leq g$  be a positive integer and  $\Theta_d \subset J$  be the image of the regular map

$$\mathcal{C}^d \rightarrow J, (Q_1, \dots, Q_d) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^d Q_i \subset J.$$

It is well known that  $\Theta_d$  is an irreducible closed  $d$ -dimensional subvariety of  $J$  that coincides with  $\mathcal{C}$  for  $d = 1$  and with  $J$  if  $d = g$ ; in addition,  $\Theta_d \subset \Theta_{d+1}$  for all  $d < g$ . Clearly, each  $\Theta_d$  is stable under multiplication by  $-1$  in  $J$ . We write  $\Theta$  for the  $(g - 1)$ -dimensional theta divisor  $\Theta_{g-1}$ .

**Theorem 2.6** (See Th. 2.5 of [9]). *Suppose that  $g > 1$  and let*

$$\mathcal{C}_{1/2} := 2^{-1}\mathcal{C} \subset J$$

*be the preimage of  $\mathcal{C}$  with respect to multiplication by 2 in  $J$ . Then the intersection of  $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}(K)$  and  $\Theta$  consists of points of order dividing 2 on  $J$ . In particular, the intersection of  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$  consists of  $\infty$  and all  $\mathfrak{W}_\alpha$ 's.*

## 3. ADDING WEIERSTRASS POINTS

In this section we discuss how to compute a sum  $\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{W}_\beta$  in  $J(K)$  when  $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$  lies neither on  $\Theta$  nor on its translation  $\Theta + \mathfrak{W}_\beta$ . Let  $D - g(\infty)$  be the reduced divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$ , whose class represents  $\mathfrak{a}$ . Here

$$D = \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j) \text{ where } Q_j = (a_j, b_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \setminus \{\infty\}$$

is a degree  $g$  effective divisor. Let  $(U(x), V(x))$  be the Mumford representation of  $\text{cl}(D - g(\infty))$ . We have

$$\deg(U) = g > \deg(V)$$

,

$$U(x) = \prod_{j=1}^g (x - a_j), \quad b_j = V(a_j) \quad \forall j$$

and  $f(x) - V(x)^2$  is divisible by  $U(x)$ .

**Example 3.1.** Assume additionally that *none* of  $Q_j$  coincides with  $\mathfrak{W}_\beta = (\beta, 0)$ , i.e.,

$$U(\beta) \neq 0.$$

Let us find explicitly the Mumford representation  $(U^{[\beta]}(x), V^{[\beta]}(x))$  of the sum

$$\mathfrak{a} + \mathfrak{W}_\beta = \text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) + \text{cl}((\mathfrak{W}_\beta) - (\infty)) = \text{cl}((D + (\mathfrak{W}_\beta)) - (g+1)(\infty)) = \text{cl}(D_1 - (g+1)(\infty)).$$

where

$$D_1 := D + (\mathfrak{W}_\beta) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j) \right) + (\mathfrak{W}_\beta)$$

is a degree  $(g+1)$  effective divisor on  $\mathcal{C}$ . (We will see that  $\deg(\tilde{U}^{[\beta]}) = g$ .) Clearly,  $D_1 - (g+1)(\infty)$  is *semi-reduced* but *not reduced*.

Let us consider the polynomials

$$U_1(x) = (x - \beta)U(x), \quad V_1(x) = V(x) - \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x) \in K[x].$$

Then  $U_1$  is a degree  $(g+1)$  monic polynomial,  $\deg(V_1) \leq g$ ,

$$V_1(\beta) = 0, \quad V_1(a_j) = V(a_j) = b_j \quad \forall j$$

and  $f(x) - V_1(x)^2$  is divisible by  $U_1(x)$ . (The last assertion follows from the divisibility of both  $f(x)$  and  $V_1(x)$  by  $x - \beta$  combined with the divisibility of  $f(x) - V(x)^2$  by  $U(x)$ .) If we put

$$a_{g+1} = \beta, \quad b_{g+1} = 0, \quad Q_{g+1} = \mathfrak{W}_\beta = (\beta, 0)$$

then

$$U_1(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{g+1} (x - a_j), \quad D_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{g+1} (Q_j) \text{ where } Q_j = (a_j, b_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K), \quad b_j = V_1(a_j) \quad \forall j$$

and  $f(x) - V_1(x)^2$  is divisible by  $U_1(x)$ . In particular,  $(U_1(x), V_1(x))$  is the pair of polynomials that corresponds to semi-reduced  $D_1 - (g+1)(\infty)$  as described in [8, Prop. 13.4 and Th. 3.5]. In order to find the Mumford representation of

$\text{cl}(D_1 - (g+1)(\infty))$ , we use an algorithm described in [8, Th. 13.9]. Namely, let us put

$$\tilde{U}(x) = \frac{f(x) - V_1(x)^2}{U_1(x)} \in K[x].$$

Since  $\deg(V_1(x)) \leq g$  and  $\deg(f) = 2g+1$ , we have

$$\deg(V_1(x)^2) \leq 2g, \quad \deg(f(x) - V_1(x)^2) = 2g+1, \quad \deg(\tilde{U}(x)) = g.$$

Since  $f(x)$  is monic,  $f(x) - V_1(x)^2$  is also monic and therefore  $\tilde{U}(x)$  is also monic, because  $U_1(x)$  is monic. By [8, Th. 13.9],  $U^{[\beta]}(x) = \tilde{U}(x)$  (since the latter is monic and has degree  $g \leq g$ ) and  $V^{[\beta]}(x)$  is the remainder of  $-V_1(x)$  with respect to division by  $\tilde{U}(x)$ . Let us find this remainder. We have

$$-V_1(x) = -\left(V(x) - \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x)\right) = -V(x) + \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x).$$

Recall that

$$\deg(V) < g = \deg(U) = \deg(\tilde{U}).$$

This implies that the coefficient of  $-V_1$  at  $x^g$  equals  $V(\beta)/U(\beta)$  and therefore

$$V^{[\beta]}(x) = \left(-V(x) + \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x)\right) - \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}\tilde{U}(x) = -V(x) + \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}(U(x) - \tilde{U}(x)).$$

Using formulas above for  $U_1, V_1, \tilde{U}$ , we obtain that

$$(3) \quad U^{[\beta]}(x) = \frac{f(x) - \left(V(x) - \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x)\right)^2}{(x-\beta)U(x)},$$

$$(4) \quad V^{[\beta]}(x) = -V(x) + \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)} \left( U(x) - \frac{f(x) - \left(V(x) - \frac{V(\beta)}{U(\beta)}U(x)\right)^2}{(x-\beta)U(x)} \right).$$

**Remark 3.2.** There is an algorithm of David Cantor [8, Sect. 13.3] that explains how to compute the Mumford representation of a sum of arbitrary divisor classes (elements of  $J(K)$ ) when their Mumford representations are given.

**Remark 3.3.** Suppose that  $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$  and  $P = 2\mathfrak{a}$  lies in  $\mathcal{C}(K)$  but is not the zero of the group law. Then  $\mathfrak{a}$  does not lie on the theta divisor (Theorem 2.6) and satisfies the conditions of Example 3.1 for all  $\beta \in \mathfrak{R}$  (see Subsect. 2.1).

#### 4. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

Let us choose an order on  $\mathfrak{R}$ . This allows us to identify  $\mathfrak{R}$  with  $\{1, \dots, 2g, 2g+1\}$  and list elements of  $\mathfrak{R}$  as  $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g}, \alpha_{2g+1}\}$ . Then

$$f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i)$$

and the affine equation for  $\mathcal{C} \setminus \{\infty\}$  is

$$y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i).$$

Slightly abusing notation, we denote  $\mathfrak{W}_{\alpha_i}$  by  $\mathfrak{W}_i$ .



Let us consider the closed affine  $K$ -subset  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  in the affine  $K$ -space  $\mathbb{A}^{2g+1}$  with coordinate functions  $z_1, \dots, z_{2g}, z_{2g+1}$  that is cut out by the system of quadratic equations

$$z_1^2 + \alpha_1 = z_2^2 + \alpha_2 = \dots = z_{2g+1}^2 + \alpha_{2g+1}.$$

We write  $x$  for the regular function  $z_i^2 + \alpha_i$  on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ , which does *not* depend on a choice of  $i$ . By Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, the  $K$ -algebra  $K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}]$  of regular functions on  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  is canonically isomorphic to the following  $K$ -algebra. First, we need to consider the quotient  $A$  of the polynomial  $K[x]$ -algebra  $K[x][T_1, \dots, T_{2g+1}]$  by the ideal generated by all quadratic polynomials  $T_i^2 - (x - \alpha_i)$ . Next,  $K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}]$  is canonically isomorphic to the quotient  $A/\mathcal{N}(A)$  where  $\mathcal{N}(A)$  is the nilradical of  $A$ . In the next section (Example 5.4) we will prove that  $A$  has no zero divisors (in particular,  $\mathcal{N}(A) = \{0\}$ ) and therefore  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  is *irreducible*. (See also [3].) We write  $y$  for the regular function

$$y = -\prod_{i=1}^{2g} z_i \in K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}].$$

Clearly,  $y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g} (x - \alpha_i)$  in  $K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}]$ . The pair  $(x, y)$  gives rise to the finite regular map of affine  $K$ -varieties (actually, curves)

$$(5) \quad \mathfrak{h} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\infty\}, (r_1, \dots, r_{2g}, r_{2g+1}) \mapsto (a, b) = \left( r_1^2 + \alpha_1, -\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i \right)$$

of degree  $2^{2g}$ . For each

$$P = (a, b) \in K^2 = \mathbb{A}^2(K) \text{ with } b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (a - \alpha_i)$$

the fiber  $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(P) = \mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$  consists of (familiar) collections of square roots

$$\mathfrak{r} = \{r_i = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} \mid 1 \leq i \leq 2g + 1\}$$

with  $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b$ . Each such  $\mathfrak{r}$  gives rise to  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} \in J(K)$  such that

$$2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$$

(see [9, Th. 3.2]). On the other hand, for each  $\mathfrak{W}_l = (\alpha_l, 0)$  (with  $1 \leq l \leq 2g + 1$ ) the sum  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l$  is also a half of  $P$  and therefore corresponds to a certain collection of square roots. Which one? The answer is given by Theorem 1.1. We repeat its statement, using the new notation.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $P = (a, b)$  be a  $K$ -point on  $\mathcal{C}$  and  $\mathfrak{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{2g}, r_{2g+1})$  be a collection of square roots  $r_i = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} \in K$  such that  $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b$ . Let  $l$  be an integer that satisfies  $1 \leq l \leq 2g + 1$  and let*

$$(6) \quad \mathfrak{r}^{[l]} = \left( r_1^{[l]}, \dots, r_{2g}^{[l]}, r_{2g+1}^{[l]} \right) \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(P) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$$

be the collection of square roots  $r_i^{[l]} = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$  such that

$$(7) \quad r_l^{[l]} = r_l, \quad r_i^{[l]} = -r_i \quad \forall i \neq l.$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}^{[l]}}.$$

**Example 4.2.** Let us take as  $P$  the point  $\mathfrak{W}_l = (\alpha_l, 0)$ . Then

$$r_l = \sqrt{\alpha_l - \alpha_l} = 0 \quad \forall \mathfrak{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{2g}, r_{2g+1}) \in \mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{W}_l)$$

and therefore

$$\mathfrak{r}^{[l]} = (-r_1, \dots, -r_{2g}, -r_{2g+1}) = -\mathfrak{r}.$$

It follows from Example 1.3 (if we take  $\beta = \alpha_l$ ) that

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l = \mathfrak{a}_{-\mathfrak{r}} - \mathfrak{W}_l = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} - 2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = -\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}^{[l]}}.$$

This proves Theorem 4.1 in the case of  $P = \mathfrak{W}_l$ . We are going to deduce the general case from this special one.

**4.3.** Before starting the proof of Theorem 4.1, let us define for each collections of signs

$$\varepsilon = \{\epsilon_i = \pm 1 \mid 1 \leq i \leq 2g+1, \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \epsilon_i = 1\}$$

the biregular automorphism

$$T_\varepsilon : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \quad z_i \mapsto \epsilon_i z_i \quad \forall i.$$

Clearly, all  $T_\varepsilon$  constitute a finite automorphism group of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  that leaves invariant every  $K$ -fiber of  $\mathfrak{h} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\infty\}$ , acting on it **transitively**. Notice that if  $T_\varepsilon$  leaves invariant all the points of a certain fiber  $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(P)$  with  $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$  then all the  $\epsilon_i = 1$ , i.e.,  $T_\varepsilon$  is the identity map.

*Proof of Theorem 4.1.* Let us put

$$\beta := \alpha_l.$$

Then we have

$$\mathfrak{W}_l = (\alpha_l, 0) = (\beta, 0).$$

Let us consider the automorphism (involution)

$$\mathfrak{s}^{[l]} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}, \quad \mathfrak{r} \mapsto \mathfrak{r}^{[l]}$$

of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  defined by (6) and (7). We need to define another (actually, it will turn out to be the same) involution (and therefore an automorphism)

$$\mathfrak{t}^{[l]} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}$$

that is defined by

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}(\mathfrak{r})} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l$$

as a composition of the following **regular** maps. First,  $\mathfrak{r} \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$  goes to the pair of polynomials  $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x), V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x))$  as in Remark 2.2, which is the Mumford representation of  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$  (see Subsect. 2.4). Second,  $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x), V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x))$  goes to the pair of polynomials  $(U^{[\beta]}(x), V^{[\beta]}(x))$  defined by formulas (3) and (3) in Section 3, which is the Mumford representation of  $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l$ . Third, applying formulas (1) and (2) in Remark 2.2 to  $(U^{[\beta]}(x), V^{[\beta]}(x))$  (instead of  $(U(x), V(x))$ ), we get at last  $\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}(\mathfrak{r}) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$  such that

$$\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}(\mathfrak{r})} = \mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} + \mathfrak{W}_l.$$

Clearly,  $\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}$  is a regular selfmap of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  that is an involution, which implies that  $\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}$  is a biregular automorphism of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$ . It is also clear that both  $\mathfrak{s}^{[l]}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}^{[l]}$  leave invariant every fiber of  $\mathfrak{h} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\infty\}$  and coincide on  $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{W}_l)$ , thanks to Example 4.2. This implies that  $\mathfrak{u} := (\mathfrak{s}^{[l]})^{-1} \mathfrak{t}^{[l]}$  is a biregular automorphism of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  that leaves

invariant every fiber of  $\mathfrak{h} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \setminus \{\infty\}$  and acts as the identity map on  $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{W}_l)$ . The invariance of each fiber of  $\mathfrak{h}$  implies that  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$  coincides with the finite union of its closed subsets  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\varepsilon$  defined by the condition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\varepsilon := \{Q \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K) \mid \mathfrak{u}(Q) = T_\varepsilon(Q)\}.$$

Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  is irreducible, the whole  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$  coincides with one of  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\varepsilon$ . In particular, the fiber

$$\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{W}_l) \subset \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_\varepsilon$$

and therefore  $T_\varepsilon$  acts identically on all points of  $\mathfrak{h}^{-1}(\mathfrak{W}_l)$ . In light of arguments of Subsect. 4.3,  $T_\varepsilon$  is the *identity map* and therefore  $\mathfrak{u}$  acts identically on the whole  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}(K)$ . This means that  $\mathfrak{s}^{[l]} = \mathfrak{t}^{[l]}$ , i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{a}_\tau + \mathfrak{W}_l = \mathfrak{a}_{\tau^{[l]}}.$$

□

**4.4.** Let  $\phi : \mathfrak{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2$  be a function that satisfies  $\sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} \phi(\alpha) = 0$ , i.e.  $\phi \in (\mathbb{F}_2^{\mathfrak{R}})^0$ . Then the finite subset

$$\text{supp}(\phi) = \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R} \mid \phi(\alpha) \neq 0\} \subset \mathfrak{R}$$

has even cardinality and the corresponding point of  $J[2]$  is

$$\mathfrak{T}_\phi = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathfrak{R}} \phi(\alpha) \mathfrak{W}_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\phi)} \mathfrak{W}_\alpha = \sum_{\gamma \notin \text{supp}(\phi)} \mathfrak{W}_\gamma.$$

**Theorem 4.5.** Let  $\tau \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$ . Let us define  $\tau^{(\phi)} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$  as follows.

$$\tau^{(\phi)}(\alpha) = -\tau(\alpha) \quad \forall \alpha \in \text{supp}(\phi); \quad \tau^{(\phi)}(\gamma) = \tau(\gamma) \quad \forall \gamma \notin \text{supp}(\phi).$$

Then

$$\mathfrak{a}_\tau + \mathfrak{T}_\phi = \mathfrak{a}_{\tau^{(\phi)}}.$$

**Remark 4.6.** If  $\phi$  is identically zero then

$$\mathfrak{T}_\phi = 0 \in J[2], \quad \tau^{(\phi)} = \tau$$

and the assertion of Theorem 4.5 is obviously true. If  $\alpha_l \in \mathfrak{R}$  and  $\phi = \psi_{\alpha_l}$ , i.e.  $\text{supp}(\phi) = \mathfrak{R} \setminus \{\alpha_l\}$  then

$$\mathfrak{T}_\phi = \mathfrak{W}_l \in J[2], \quad \tau^{(\phi)} = \tau^{[l]}$$

and the assertion of Theorem 4.5 follows from Theorem 4.1.

*Proof of Theorem 4.5.* We may assume that  $\phi$  is *not* identically zero. We need to apply Theorem 4.1  $d$  times where  $d$  is the (even) cardinality of  $\text{supp}(\phi)$  in order to get  $\tau' \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2,P}$  such that

$$\mathfrak{a}_\tau + \sum_{\alpha \in \text{supp}(\phi)} \mathfrak{W}_\alpha = \mathfrak{a}_{\tau'}.$$

Let us check how many times do we need to change the sign of each  $\tau(\beta)$ . First, if  $\beta \notin \text{supp}(\phi)$  then we need to change to sign of  $\tau(\beta)$  at every step, i.e., we do it exactly  $d$  times. Since  $d$  is even, the sign of  $\tau(\beta)$  remains the same, i.e.,

$$\tau'(\beta) = \tau(\beta) \quad \forall \beta \notin \text{supp}(\phi).$$

Now if  $\beta \in \text{supp}(\phi)$  then we need to change the sign of  $\tau(\beta)$  every time when we add  $W_\alpha$  with  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and it occurs exactly  $(d-1)$  times. On the other hand, when

we add  $\mathfrak{W}_\beta$ , we don't change the sign of  $\mathfrak{r}(\beta)$ . So, we change the sign of  $\mathfrak{r}(\beta)$  exactly  $(d-1)$  times, which implies that

$$\mathfrak{r}'(\beta) = -\mathfrak{r}(\beta) \quad \forall \beta \in \text{supp}(\phi).$$

Combining the last two displayed formula, we obtained that

$$\mathfrak{r}' = \mathfrak{r}^{(\phi)}.$$

□

## 5. USEFUL LEMMA

As usual, we define the Kronecker delta  $\delta_{ik}$  as 1 if  $i = k$  and 0 if  $i \neq k$ .

The following result is probably well known but I did not find a suitable reference. (However, see [3, Lemma 5.10] and [1, pp. 425–427].)

**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $n$  be a positive integer,  $E$  a field provided with  $n$  distinct discrete valuation maps*

$$\nu_i : E^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad (i = 1, \dots, n).$$

*For each  $i$  let  $O_{\nu_i} \subset E$  the discrete valuation ring attached to  $\nu_i$  and  $\pi_i \in O_{\nu_i}$  its uniformizer, i.e., a generator of the maximal ideal in  $O_{\nu_i}$ . Suppose that for each  $i$  we are given a prime number  $p_i$  such that the characteristic of the residue field  $O_{\nu_i}/\pi_i$  is different from  $p_k$  for all  $k \neq i$ . Let us assume also that*

$$\nu_i(\pi_k) = \delta_{ik} \quad \forall i, k = 1, \dots, n,$$

*i.e., each  $\pi_i$  is a  $\nu_k$ -adic unit if  $i \neq k$ .*

*Then the the quotient  $B = E[T_1, \dots, T_n]/(T_1^{p_1} - \pi_1, \dots, T_n^{p_n} - \pi_n)$  of the polynomial  $E$ -algebra  $E[T_1, \dots, T_n]$  by the ideal generated by all  $T_i^{p_i} - \pi_i$  is a field that is an algebraic extension of  $E$  of degree  $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$ . In addition, the set of monomials*

$$S = \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^n T_i^{e_i} \mid 0 \leq e_i \leq p_i - 1 \right\} \subset E[T_1, \dots, T_n]$$

*maps injectively into  $B$  and its image is a basis of the  $E$ -vector space  $B$ .*

**Remark 5.2.** By definition of a uniformizer,  $\nu_i(\pi_i) = 1$  for all  $i$ .

*Proof of Lemma 5.1.* First, the cardinality of  $S$  is  $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$  and the image of  $S$  generates  $B$  as the  $E$ -vector space. This implies that if the  $E$ -dimension of  $B$  is  $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$  then the image of  $S$  is a basis of the  $E$ -vector space  $B$ . Second, notice that for each  $i$  the polynomial  $T^{p_i} - \pi_i$  is irreducible over  $E$ , thanks to the Eisenstein criterion applied to  $\nu_i$  and therefore  $E[T_i]/(T^{p_i} - \pi_i)$  is a field that is an algebraic degree  $p_i$  extension of  $E$ . In particular, the  $E$ -dimension of  $E[T_i]/(T^{p_i} - \pi_i)$  is  $p_i$ . This proves Lemma for  $n = 1$ .

**Induction by  $n$ .** Suppose that  $n > 1$  and consider the finite degree  $p_i$  field extension  $E_n = E[T_n]/(T^{p_n} - \pi_n)$  of  $E$ .

Clearly, the  $E$ -algebra  $B$  is isomorphic to the quotient  $E_n[T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}]/(T_1^{p_1} - \pi_1, \dots, T_{n-1}^{p_{n-1}} - \pi_{n-1})$  of the polynomial ring  $E_n[T_1, \dots, T_{n-1}]$  by the ideal generated by all polynomials  $T_i^{p_i} - \pi_i$  with  $i < n$ . Our goal is to apply the induction assumption to  $E_n$  instead of  $E$ . In order to do that, let us consider for each  $i < n$  the integral closure  $\tilde{O}_i$  of  $O_{\nu_i}$  in  $E_n$ . It is well known that  $\tilde{O}_i$  is a Dedekind ring. Our conditions imply that  $E_n/E$  is *unramified* at all  $\nu_i$  for all  $i < n$ . This means

that if  $\mathcal{P}_i$  is a maximal ideal of  $\tilde{O}_i$  that contains  $\pi_i \tilde{O}_i$  (such an ideal always exists) and

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i} : E_n^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

is the discrete valuation map attached to  $\mathcal{P}_i$  then the restriction of  $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}$  to  $E^*$  coincides with  $\nu_i$ . This implies that for all positive integers  $i, k \leq n-1$

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(\pi_k) = \nu_i(\pi_k) = \delta_{ik}.$$

In particular,

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}(\pi_i) = \nu_i(\pi_i) = 1,$$

i.e.,  $\pi_i$  is a uniformizer in the corresponding discrete valuation (sub)ring  $O_{\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}}$  of  $E_n$  attached to  $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}$ . Now the induction assumption applied to  $E_n$  and its  $(n-1)$  discrete valuation maps  $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{P}_i}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ) implies that  $B/E_n$  is a field extension of degree  $\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i$ . This implies that the degree

$$[B : E] = [B : E_n][E_n : E] = \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} p_i \right) p_n = \prod_{i=1}^n p_i.$$

This means that the  $E$ -dimension of  $B$  is  $\prod_{i=1}^n p_i$  and therefore the image of  $S$  is a basis of the  $E$ -vector space  $B$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 5.3.** *We keep the notation and assumptions of Lemma 5.1. Let  $R$  be a subring of  $E$  that contains 1 and all  $\pi_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ). Then the quotient  $B_R = R[T_1, \dots, T_n]/(T_1^{p_1} - \pi_1, \dots, T_n^{p_n} - \pi_n)$  of the polynomial  $R$ -algebra  $R[T_1, \dots, T_n]$  by the ideal generated by all  $T_i^{p_i} - \pi_i$  has no zero divisors.*

*Proof.* There are the natural homomorphisms of  $R$ -algebras

$$R[T_1, \dots, T_n] \twoheadrightarrow B_R \rightarrow B$$

such that the first homomorphism is surjective and the *injective* image of

$$S \subset R[T_1, \dots, T_n] \subset E[T_1, \dots, T_n]$$

in  $B$  is a basis of the  $E$ -vector space  $B$ . On the other hand, the image of  $S$  generates  $B_R$  as  $R$ -module. It suffices to prove that  $B_R \rightarrow B$  is injective, since  $B$  is a field by Lemma 5.1.

Suppose that  $u \in B_R$  goes to 0 in  $B$ . Clearly,  $u$  is a linear combination of (the images of) elements of  $S$  with coefficients in  $R$ . Since the image of  $u$  in  $B$  is 0, all these coefficients are zeros, i.e.,  $u = 0$  in  $B_R$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.4.** We use the notation of Section 4. Let us put  $n = 2g + 1$ ,  $R = K[x]$ ,  $E = K(x)$ ,  $\pi_i = x - \alpha_i$ ,  $p_i = 2$  and let

$$\nu_i : E^* = K(x)^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

be the discrete valuation map of the field of rational functions  $K(x)$  attached to  $\alpha_i$ . Then  $K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}] = B_R/\mathcal{N}(B_R)$  where  $\mathcal{N}(B_R)$  is the nilradical of  $B_R$ . It follows from Corollary 5.3 that  $\mathcal{N}(B_R) = \{0\}$  and  $K[\tilde{\mathcal{C}}]$  has no zero divisors, i.e.,  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}$  is irreducible.

## REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bandman, S. Garion, F. Grunewald, *On the surjectivity of Engel words on  $\mathrm{PSL}(2, q)$* . Groups Geom. Dyn. **6** (2012), 409–439.
- [2] B.M. Bekker, Yu.G. Zarhin, *The divisibility by 2 of rational points on elliptic curves*. Algebra i Analiz **29:4** (2017), 196–239; St. Petersburg Math. J. **29** (2018), 683–713.
- [3] N. Bruin and E.V. Flynn, *Towers of 2-covers of hyperelliptic curves*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), no. 11, 4329–4347.
- [4] D. Mumford, *Tata Lectures on Theta. II*. Progress in Math. **43**, Birkhäuser, Boston Basel Stuttgart, 1984.
- [5] M. Stoll, *Arithmetic of Hyperelliptic Curves*. Available at Summer Semester 2014, University of Bayreuth. <http://www.mathe2.uni-bayreuth.de/stoll/teaching/ArithHypKurven-SS2014/Skript-ArithHypCurves-pub-screen.pdf>.
- [6] E. Schaefer, *2-descent on the Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves*. J. Number Theory **51** (1995), no. 2, 219–232.
- [7] J.-P. Serre, *Algebraic groups and class fields*. Graduate Texts in Math. **117**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [8] L.C. Washington, *Elliptic Curves: Number Theory and Cryptography*. Second edition. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton London New York, 2008.
- [9] Yu. G. Zarhin, *Division by 2 on odd degree hyperelliptic curves and their jacobians*. Izvestiya RAN **83:3** (2019), 93–112; Izvestiya Mathematics **83:3** (2019), 501–520.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY PARK, PA 16802, USA

*E-mail address:* zarhin@math.psu.edu