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Abstract: The aim of the following paper is to show that the computation of the discrete logarithm in the $m$-torsion part of the divisor class group of a curve $X$ over a finite field $k_0$ (with $(\text{char}(k_0)$ prime to $m)$ or over a local field $k$ with residue field $k_0$ can be reduced to the computation of the discrete logarithm in $k_0(\zeta_m)^\ast$. For this purpose we use a variant of the (tame) Tate pairing for Abelian varieties over local fields. In the same way the problem to determine all linear combinations of a finite set of elements in the divisor class group of a curve over $k$ or $k_0$ which are divisible by $m$ is reduced to the computation of the discrete logarithm in $k_0(\zeta_m)^\ast$.

1. Results

Let $k_0$ be a finite field with $q$ elements and $X_0$ a projective irreducible nonsingular curve of genus $g$ over $k_0$. For simplicity we assume that the curve $X_0$ has a point $P_0$ which is rational over $k_0$. Let $\text{Div}_0(X_0)$ be the group of divisors of degree 0 on $X_0$. In particular the set of divisors of functions on $X_0$ is a subgroup of this group. The quotient group, i.e. the group of divisor classes of degree 0, is denoted by $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)$. We consider a positive integer $m$ which divides $q - 1$. Then $m$ is prime to the characteristic of $k_0$ and the $m$-th roots of unity are contained in $k_0$. We denote by $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m$ the group of divisor classes whose $m$-fold is zero.

We want to treat the problem of the discrete logarithm in the group $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m$: Let $D_1$ and $D_2$ be given elements in $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m$ with $D_2 = \mu D_1$ with $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$, then evaluate the integer $\mu$ (notice that the group law in $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)$ is written additively contrary to the notation “discrete logarithm”).

In particular we want to reduce this problem to the corresponding one in the multiplicative group $k_0^\ast$: Given elements $\eta$ and $\zeta$ of $k_0^\ast$ with an integer $\mu$ such that $\zeta = \eta^\mu$, determine this element $\mu$.

It is not our aim to give explicit formulas for the addition law in $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)$. We want to assume that the elements in $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)$ are represented in the following way: The Theorem of Riemann-Roch asserts that each class of $\text{Pic}_0(X_0)$ contains a divisor of the form $A - gP_0$, where $A$ is a positive divisor on $X_0$ of degree $g$ (without mentioning it explicitly we mean that the divisor $A$ is rational over $k_0$.) If $A$ is given as $A = \sum_{i=1}^g P_i$, then...
then the points $P_i$ on $X_0$ are rational over a finite extension of $k_0$ of degree $g!$. Notice that this degree is independent of the field $k_0$.

Now we assume that we know the surjective map $c_g$ which assigns to each positive divisor $A$ of degree $g$ the class $c_g(A) = A - gP_0$ in Pic$_0(X_0)$; furthermore the addition in Pic$_0(X_0)$ should be given explicitly, in other words we assume that it is possible to solve the following problem in a fixed number of elementary operations in $k_0$:

\[ (*) \quad \text{Let } A_1 \text{ and } A_2 \text{ be positive divisors of degree } g \text{ on } X_0, \text{ find a positive divisor } A_3 \text{ of degree } g \text{ and a function } h \text{ on } X_0 \text{ such that the divisor of } h \text{ is equal to } A_1 + A_2 - A_3 - gP_0. \]

In the following the evaluation of $(*)$ will be called a step.

In general it will be hard to satisfy these assumptions. We will give two examples where the solution of the computational problems in Pic$_0(X_0)$ is well known:

**Examples:**
a) If $X_0$ is an elliptic curve given by an affine equation $y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$, let $P_0$ be the point at infinity. Then three points $P_i (i = 1, 2, 3)$ with coordinates $(x_i, y_i)$ satisfy $P_1 - P_0 + P_2 - P_0 + P_3 - P_0 = 0$ in Pic$_0(X_0)$ if and only if the points $(x_i, y_i)(i = 1, 2, 3)$ lie on a straight line $l(x, y)$. Furthermore $P_1 - P_0$ is the inverse of $P_2 - P_0$ if and only if $x_1 = x_2$ and $y_1 = -y_2$. Hence the function $h$ in $(*)$ is given by the equation $l(x, y)$.

b) If $X_0$ is a hyperelliptic curve, then the addition law $(*)$ can be given by a reduction algorithm (see e.g. [Ko]).

The key point of the following is the construction of a non-degenerate pairing and the estimation of its computing time.

**Notation:** Let $D$ be a divisor with $D \in$ Pic$_0(X_0)_m$ and let $E = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i P_i$ ($a_i \in \mathbb{Z}, P_i$ on $X_0$) be an element in Div$_0(X_0)$ such that $D$ and $E$ have no points in common; furthermore let $f$ be a function whose divisor is equal to $mD$. Then define $f(E) := \prod_{i=1}^r f(P_i)^{a_i}$.

**Theorem:** If $m$ divides $q - 1$, then the assignment $\{ \overline{D}, \overline{E} \}_{0,m} := f(E)$ defines a non-degenerate bilinear pairing

\[ \{ \overline{D}, \overline{E} \}_{0,m} : \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \times \text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m\text{Pic}_0(X_0) \longrightarrow k_0^*/k_0^{*m}. \]

For given $\overline{D}$ and $\overline{E}$ the value $f(E)$ can be evaluated in log $m$ steps, i.e. one has to perform log $m$ times a fixed number of elementary operations in an extension field of $k_0$ of bounded degree. ♣

In chapter 2 we show that $\{ \overline{D}, \overline{E} \}_{0,m}$ is indeed a non-degenerate pairing; this is the crucial part of the theorem. Finally in the third chapter the complexity of the evaluation of $f(E)$ is studied.

From this theorem we get as a corollary the reduction of the discrete logarithm.
Let \( X \) be an elliptic curve. We want to discuss the assumptions of the theorem in the case of an elliptic curve.

Remarks:

1. There is an irreducible polynomial \( F(X,Y) \in l_0[X,Y] \) whose degree in \( Y \) is bounded by \( g \) such that (up to a finite set whose cardinality is bounded by \( g \))
the zeros of \( F(X,Y) \) in \( l_0 \) are the \( l_0 \)-rational points on \( X_0 \).

2. By the theorem of Riemann-Roch we have
\[
|\# X_0(l_0) - \# l_0 - 1| \leq 2g(\# l_0)^{1/2}.
\]
Hence there is a positive probability depending only on the genus \( g \) that to a value \( x \in l_0 \) there is a \( y \in l_0 \) such that \( F(x,y) = 0 \). Note that the existence of \( y \) can be tested in a probabilistic polynomial time in \( \log q \) by Berlekamp’s algorithm.

From this one sees that it is possible to find an element in \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \) in a probabilistic polynomial time in \( \log q \) ; and since multiplication by \( m \) needs only \( O(\log q) \) steps, the same is true for an element in \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) in all interesting cases where \( m \) is of the same size as \( q \) , i.e. \( \frac{q-1}{m} \) is bounded by a small integer.

The next task is to determine generators of \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) in a probabilistic polynomial time in \( \log q \). For sake of simplicity we explain this in the special case that \( m \) is prime. Then \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) is isomorphic to \( (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^r \), where \( r \) is bounded by \( 2g \). The probability that \( r \) elements form a basis of \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) is positive and independent of \( q \). The same is true for \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \). If one wants to verify that one actually has bases of \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) and \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \) one uses the non-degenerate pairing \( \{ \, , \}_{0,m} \) of the theorem. Since the evaluation of \( \{ \, , \}_{0,m} \) can be done in \( \log m \) steps, it is possible to find bases in a probabilistic polynomial time in \( \log q \).

Let now \( \{ E_1, \ldots , E_r \} \) be a basis of \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \). Let \( D_1 \) and \( D_2 \) be elements in \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) with \( D_2 = \mu D_1 \) with an integer \( \mu \). For each \( i = 1, \ldots , r \) we compute \( \eta_i = \{ D_1, E_i \}_{0,m} \) and \( \zeta_i = \{ D_2, E_i \}_{0,m} \). This can be done in a polynomial time in \( \log q \).

We get \( \zeta_i \equiv \eta_i^\mu \) modulo \( k_0^m \) for each \( i \). Since the pairing \( \{ \, , \}_{0,m} \) is non-degenerate, there is a unique solution \( \mu \) (modulo \( m \)) which can be evaluated by an algorithm for the discrete logarithm in \( k_0^* \). ♠️

Remarks:

1) The discrete logarithm for some finite fields \( k_0^* \) is known to be subexponential (cf. [O]).

2) We want to discuss the assumptions of the theorem in the case of an elliptic curve. Let \( X_0 \) be an elliptic curve over a finite field \( k_0 \) with \( q(q = p^f) \) elements. The theory of the zetafunctions yields (cf. [Wa])
\[
\# \text{Pic}_0(X_0) = (1 - \omega)(1 - \overline{\omega})
\]

where \(\omega, \overline{\omega}\) are complex numbers with \(\omega \overline{\omega} = q\) and \(|\omega| = |\overline{\omega}| = q^{1/2}\). If \(k_0\) is an extension of \(k_0\) of degree \(n\), then

\[
\# \text{Pic}_0(X_0 \times \tilde{k}_0) = (1 - \omega^n)(1 - \overline{\omega}^n).
\]

If the elliptic curve is supersingular, i.e. \(p\) divides \(\omega + \overline{\omega}\), then \(\omega^n = \overline{\omega^n}\) for \(n = 1, 2, 3, 4\) or \(6\) (cf. [Wa], see also the discussion in [M-V-O]). Hence if \(m\) divides \(\# \text{Pic}_0(X_0)\) then the \(m\)-th roots of unity are contained in \(\tilde{k}_0\) where \(\tilde{k}_0/k_0\) is an extension of degree at most \(6\).

Let now the elliptic curve be ordinary, i.e. \(p\) does not divide \(\omega + \overline{\omega}\). Suppose \(m\) is a prime number which is inert in the imaginary quadratic field \(\mathbb{Q}(\omega)\). If \(m\) divides \(\# \text{Pic}_0(X_0)\) then the \(m\)-th roots of unity are contained in \(k_0\) where \(k_0/k_0\) is an extension of degree at most \(6\).

3) The authors of [M-V-O] use the Weil pairing to reduce the discrete logarithm of elliptic curves to the discrete logarithm of the multiplicative group. If one uses the Weil pairing, one must assume that all the \(m\)-torsion points of the elliptic curve are defined over \(k_0\). This implies that \(k_0\) contains the \(m\)-th roots of unity. But the converse is not true in general. However the main advantage of our pairing is the following. If the genus of \(X_0\) is greater than 1, it is much weaker to assume that the \(m\)-th roots of unity are in \(k_0\) than forcing all \(m\)-torsion points to be defined over \(k_0\). Also a generalization of the Weil pairing algorithm, which is indeed possible, affords calculations of functions on the Jacobian variety of the curve \(X_0\), whereas our algorithm only deals with functions on the curve \(X_0\) itself.

**Examples of hyperelliptic curves.** Koblitz [Ko] considers hyperelliptic curves to be used as cryptosystems based on the discrete logarithm. As examples he gives curves \(X_0\) of genus 2 over a finite field \(k_0\) of characteristic 2 with the equations a) \(v^2 + v = u^5 + u^3\), b) \(v^2 + v = u^5 + u^3 + u\), or c) \(v^2 + v = u^5\). An easy computation shows that if \(m\) divides \(\# \text{Pic}_0(X_0)\), then the \(m\)-th roots of unity are contained in \(k_0\) where \(k_0/k_0\) is an extension of degree \(n\) with \(n = 12, 6\) or 4 in case a), b), or c), respectively. Hence the discrete logarithm of \((k_0)^*\) is not too “complicated” compared with the logarithm in \(k_0^*\).

Changing the role of \(\text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m\) and \(\text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m \text{ Pic}_0(X_0)\) one gets

**Corollary 2:** Let \(\bar{E}_1, \ldots, \bar{E}_s\) be elements in \(\text{Pic}_0(X_0)\). The evaluation of the set

\[
\left\{ (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_s) \in (\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z})^s \big| \sum_{i=1}^s \lambda_i \bar{E}_i \in m \text{ Pic}_0(X_0) \right\}
\]

can be reduced to the evaluation of at most \((2g)^2\) discrete logarithms in \(k_0^*\) in probabilistic polynomial time in \(\log q\).
Proof: Let \( \{ D_1, \ldots, D_r \} \) be a basis of \( \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) which will be constructed as in Corollary 1. Let \( \omega \) be a primitive root in \( k_0^* \). If one has \( a_{ji} \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} \) \( (j = 1, \ldots, r; i = 1, \ldots, s) \) with \( \{ D_j, E_i \}_{0,m} = \omega^{a_{ji}} \), then \( \sum_{i=1}^{s} a_{ji} \lambda_i \equiv 0 \mod m \) \( (j = 1, \ldots, r) \). ♣

Remark: If \( k \) is a local field and \( X \) is a curve with good reduction at the valuation of \( k \), then results similar to the theorem and the corollaries can be proved. Indeed in the next chapter we first study a pairing \( \{ , \} \) for the curve \( X \) over \( k \) and then reduce it to our pairing \( \{ , \}_{0,m} \) of the theorem.

2. The Pairing

Let \( k \) be a local field, i.e. \( k \) is either a finite extension of a \( p \)-adic field \( \mathbb{Q}_p \) or a power series field over a finite field \( \mathbb{F}_q \) with \( q = p^f \). \( k \) is complete with respect to a discrete valuation \( v \) with residue field \( k_0 \). By \( \overline{k} \) we denote the separable closure of \( k \), and \( G_k \) is the Galois group of \( \overline{k}/k \).

Let \( X \) be a projective irreducible nonsingular curve of genus \( g \) over \( k \). For simplicity we assume that \( X \) has a \( k \)-rational point. Let \( \overline{X} \) be equal to \( X \times \overline{k} \) and \( X_0 \) be the special fibre of the minimal model of \( X \) with respect to \( v \). We will assume that \( X \) has good reduction modulo \( v \) and so \( X_0 \) is a nonsingular irreducible projective curve over \( k_0 \) of genus \( g \).

Some more notation: Let \( \overline{k}(X) \) be the field of functions on \( X \), by \( \text{Div}_0(X) \) we denote the \( G_k \)-module of divisors (of degree 0) of \( X \), \( H(X) \) are the principal divisors and \( \text{Pic}_0(X) \) is the factor \( G_k \)-module \( \text{Div}_0(X)/H(X) \).

We have the following exact sequences of the \( G_k \)-modules

\[
1 \to \overline{k}^* \to \overline{k}(X)^* \to H(X) \to 0
\]

and

\[
0 \to H(X) \to \text{Div}_0(X) \to \text{Pic}_0(X) \to 0 ,
\]

and hence sequences of cohomology groups

\[
H^2(G_k, \overline{k}(X)^*) \xrightarrow{\phi} H^2(G_k, H(X)) \to H^3(G_k, \overline{k}^*) = 0
\]

and

\[
0 = H^1(G_k, \text{Div}_0(X)) \to H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X)) \xrightarrow{\delta} H^2(G_k, H(X)) .
\]
Remark: \( H^1(G_k, \text{Div}_0(X)) = 0 \), because there is a divisor of degree 1 in \( \text{Div}(X)^{G_k} \) by assumption. For the following construction cf. [Li].

Take a cohomology class \( \alpha \in H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X)) \) and let \( \beta \) be an element in \( H^2(G_k, \overline{k}(X)^*) \) with \( \delta(\alpha) = \varphi(\beta) \). Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be a class in \( \text{Pic}_0(X)^{G_k} = \text{Pic}_0(X) \). It is easily proved (cf. [Li]) that there is a 2-cocycle \( (f_{\sigma, \tau})_{\sigma, \tau} \in G_k \) and a divisor \( D \in \mathcal{D} \) such that for all \( \sigma, \tau \in G_k \) the principal divisor of \( f_{\sigma, \tau} \) is prime to \( D \). This allows to define:

\[
c_{\sigma, \tau} := f_{\sigma, \tau}(D) := \prod_{P \in \overline{k}} f_{\sigma, \tau}(P)^{n_P} \quad \text{where } D = \sum n_P P .
\]

Again it is not difficult to see (cf. [Li] again) that \( (c_{\sigma, \tau}) \) is a 2-cocycle from \( G_k \) to \( \overline{k}^* \) and that its class \( [c_{\sigma, \tau}] \in H^2(G_k, \overline{k}) \) depends only on \( \alpha \) and \( \mathcal{D} \).

Define \( \langle \alpha, \mathcal{D} \rangle := [c_{\sigma, \tau}] \).

An important result of Lichtenbaum [Li] is

**Proposition 2.1:** The map

\[
\langle \ , \rangle : H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X)) \times \text{Pic}_0(X) \to H^2(G_k, \overline{k}) \cong \mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Z}
\]

is a non-degenerate pairing.

Since \( H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X)) \) is a torsion group, we can restate this proposition:

**Proposition 2.1':** For all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) we have a non-degenerate pairing

\[
\langle \ , \rangle_m : H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X))_m \times \text{Pic}_0(X)/m \ \text{Pic}_0(X) \to H^2(G_k, \overline{k})_m \cong \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}
\]

Remark: A crucial step in the paper of Lichtenbaum is to show that \( \langle \ , \rangle \) is (up to a sign) equal to the Tate pairing (cf. [Ta]).

From now on we assume that \( m \) is prime to the characteristic of \( k_0 \). Our aim is to transform the pairing \( \langle \ , \rangle_m \) into an easily computable shape. At first we assume in addition that the \( m \)-th roots of unity are contained in \( k \).

**Lemma 2.2:** Assume that the \( m \)-th roots of unity are contained in \( k \). Let \( \pi \) be a uniformising element of \( k \), i.e. \( \pi \) generates the maximal ideal of \( v \), and let \( \langle \tau \rangle \) be the Galois group of \( k(\sqrt{\pi})/k \). Then

\[
H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(X))_m = \inf_{\overline{k}} H^1(\langle \tau \rangle, \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\sqrt{\pi})))_m \n\]

\[
= \text{Hom}(\langle \tau \rangle, \text{Pic}_0(X)_m) .
\]
The maximal $m$-quotient of $G_{k_u}$ is cyclic and equal to $G(k_u(\sqrt{\pi})/k_u)$, hence

$$H^1(G_k, \text{Pic}_0(\overline{X}))_m = \text{Hom}(G(k_u(\sqrt{\pi})/k_u), \text{Pic}_0(\overline{X})_m)^{G(k_u/k)}.$$ 

Since $\tau$ commutes with each element of $G(k_u/k)$ the latter is equal to $\text{Hom}(\langle \tau \rangle, \text{Pic}_0(X)_m)$. ✞

Lemma 2.2 shows that the restriction of the pairing in Proposition 2.1’

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_m : H^1(\langle \tau \rangle, \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\sqrt{\pi}))_m \times \text{Pic}_0(X)/m \cdot \text{Pic}_0(X) \to H^2(\langle \tau \rangle, k(\sqrt{\pi})^*)$$

is non-degenerate. Let $\varphi$ be the map which assigns to $\overline{D} \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m$ the class of the 1-cocycle $(f_{\rho})_{\rho \in \langle \tau \rangle}$ with $f_{\tau} = \overline{D}$. It is another consequence of the lemma that $\varphi$ is an isomorphism from $\text{Pic}_0(X)_m$ onto $H^1(\langle \tau \rangle, \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\sqrt{\pi}))_m)$.

The group $H^2(\langle \tau \rangle, k(\sqrt{\pi})^*)$ is canonically isomorphic to $k^*/N_k(\sqrt{\pi})/k(k(\sqrt{\pi})^*)$ where $N_k(\sqrt{\pi})/k$ denotes the norm map. Since $m$ is prime to the characteristic of the residue field $k_0$ and since $k(\sqrt{\pi})/k$ is fully ramified, the latter is isomorphic to $k_0^*/k_0^{sm}$ . We denote by $\psi$ the isomorphism from $H^2(\langle \tau \rangle, k(\sqrt{\pi})^*)$ onto $k_0^*/k_0^{sm}$.

If we apply the isomorphisms $\varphi$ and $\psi$ we get a non-degenerate pairing between $\text{Pic}_0(X)_m$ and $\text{Pic}_0(X)/m \text{Pic}_0(X)$. 
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We describe this pairing in a different manner. Take \( D \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m \) and a divisor \( D \in \mathcal{D} \), then \( mD \) is the divisor of a function \( f \). Let \( E \in \text{Pic}_0(X) \) be a representative of a class modulo \( m \text{Pic}_0(X) \) and let \( E \) be a divisor in \( \overline{E} \). We can choose \( E \) such that \( E \) and \( D \) are prime modulo \( v \). Then \( f(E) \) is by definition \( \Pi f(P)^n_P \), where \( E = \Sigma n_P P \), depends only on the divisor of \( f \). Now Weil reciprocity allows us to define \( \{ D, E \}_m := f(\overline{E}) \) in \( k_0^*/k_0^{*m} \). An explicit calculation shows that \( \{ , \}_m \) is a new definition of the original pairing \( \{ , \} \), i.e. we get

**Proposition 2.3:** Let \( m \in \mathbf{N} \) be prime to the characteristic of \( k_0 \) and assume that the \( m \)-th roots of unity are contained in \( k \), then

\[
\{ , \}_m : \text{Pic}_0(X)_m \times \text{Pic}_0(X)/m\text{Pic}_0(X) \to k_0^*/k_0^{*m}
\]

satisfies \( \{ D, E \}_m = \psi(\varphi(\overline{D}), \overline{E})_m \) for each \( D \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m, E \) in \( \text{Pic}_0(X) \). In particular \( \{ , \}_m \) is non-degenerate. ♡

What can be done when the \( m \)-th roots of unity are not contained in \( k \)?

Let \( \zeta_m \) be a primitive \( m \)-th root of unity and let \( \langle \sigma \rangle \) be the Galois group of \( k(\zeta_m)/k \). We denote by \( \chi_m \) the cyclotomic character of \( \langle \sigma \rangle \) defined by \( \sigma(\zeta_m) = \zeta_m^{\chi_m(\sigma)} \).

Now we consider the non-degenerate pairing of Proposition 2.3 for the field \( k(\zeta_m) \)

\[
\{ , \}_m : \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))_m \times \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))/m\text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m)) \to k_0^*(\zeta_m)/k_0^{*m}(\zeta_m) \to k_0^*(\zeta_m)/k_0^{*m}.
\]

The group \( \langle \sigma \rangle \) acts on divisors, the operation on \( k_0^*(\zeta_m)/k_0^{*m}(\zeta_m) \) is induced by \( \chi_m \), hence we get

\[
\{ \sigma(\overline{D}), \sigma(\overline{E}) \}_m = \{ \overline{D}, \overline{E} \}_{\chi_m(\sigma)}.
\]

If \( [k(\zeta_m) : k] \) is prime to \( m \), then the action of \( \langle \sigma \rangle \) is semisimple and the decomposition in eigenspaces for characters yields a non-degenerate pairing

\[
\{ , \}_m : \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))_m[\chi_m] \times (\text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))/m\text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m)))^{(\sigma)} \to k_0^*(\zeta_m)/k_0^{*m},
\]

where \( \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))_m[\chi_m] \) is the subgroup of elements \( \overline{D} \in \text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))_m \) which satisfy \( \sigma(\overline{D}) = \chi_m(\sigma)\overline{D} \).

Again using the fact that \( [k(\zeta_m) : k] \) is prime to \( m \) one sees that

\( (\text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m))/m\text{Pic}_0(X \times k(\zeta_m)))^{(\sigma)} \) is canonically isomorphic to \( \text{Pic}_0(X)/m\text{Pic}_0(X) \). This yields
Proposition 2.4: Let \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) be prime to the characteristic of \( k_0 \). Let \( \zeta_m \) be a primitive \( m \)-th root of unity and assume that the degree of \( k(\zeta_m)/k \) is prime to \( m \), then \( \{ , \}_m \) is a non-degenerate pairing

\[
\{ , \}_m : \text{Pic}_0(\mathbb{P}^1 \times k(\zeta_m))_m[\chi_m] \times \text{Pic}_0(\mathbb{P}^1)/m \text{Pic}_0(\mathbb{P}^1) \to k_0(\zeta_m)^*/k_0(\zeta_m)^m .
\]

Remark: Proposition 2.3 is a special case of the last statement. The assumptions of Proposition 2.4 are satisfied, if \( m \) is a prime number different from the characteristic of \( k_0 \).

The definition of \( \{ , \}_m \) can be reduced modulo \( v \) to get a pairing corresponding to a curve over a finite field.

Let \( X_0 \) be a projective irreducible nonsingular curve of genus \( g \) over a finite field \( k_0 \). Take \( D_0 \in \text{Pic}_0(X_0)_m \) and \( E_0 \in \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \) and choose divisors \( D_0 \in \mathcal{D}_0 \) and \( E_0 \in \mathcal{E}_0 \) which are relatively coprime. Then \( mD_0 \) is the divisor of a function \( f_0 \), and we can define \( \{ D_0, E_0 \}_0,m := f_0(E_0) \) in \( k_0^*/k_0^m \). This definition only deals with curves over finite fields. In order to prove that \( \{ , \}_m \) is non-degenerate we take a local field \( k \) with residue field \( k_0 \) and a curve \( X \) of genus \( g \) whose special fibre is \( X_0 \). It is not difficult to see that \( \{ D_0, E_0 \}_0,m = \{ \mathcal{D}, \mathcal{E} \}_m \) where \( D, E \) are divisors whose reduction is \( D_0, E_0 \) respectively. With this remark we get from Propositions 2.3 and 2.4

Proposition 2.5: Let \( m \in \mathbb{N} \) be prime to the characteristic of \( k_0 \). Let \( \zeta_m \) be a primitive \( m \)-th root of unity and assume that the degree of \( k_0(\zeta_m)/k_0 \) is prime to \( m \), then the pairing

\[
\{ , \}_0,m : \text{Pic}_0(X_0 \times k_0(\zeta_m))_m[\chi_0] \times \text{Pic}_0(X_0)/m \text{Pic}_0(X_0) \to k_0(\zeta_m)^*/k_0(\zeta_m)^m
\]

is non-degenerate. ♡

If \( m \) divides \( q - 1 \), then Proposition 2.5 shows the first part of the theorem in the first chapter.

3. Evaluation of the pairing

In the previous chapter it was shown that the evaluation of the Tate pairing can be reduced to the following problem: Let \( k \) be a field whose characteristic does not divide \( m \) and let \( X \) be a projective irreducible nonsingular curve over \( k \) of genus \( g \). For elements \( \mathcal{D} \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m \) and \( \mathcal{E} \in \text{Pic}_0(X) \) take any divisor \( D \in \mathcal{D} \) and find a function \( f \) on \( X \) whose divisor is equal to \( mD \), take a divisor \( E \in \mathcal{E} \) which is prime to \( D \) and then evaluate \( f(E) \).

In the following we present an algorithm for an evaluation of \( f(E) \) which takes \( O(\log m) \) elementary operations. In order to achieve this it is of course necessary to do explicit
calculations in the group $\text{Pic}_0(X)$. As it was pointed out in chapter 1 we assume that we can do the following step

(*) Let $A_1$ and $A_2$ be positive divisors of degree $g$, find a positive divisor $A_3$ of degree $g$ and a function $h$ such that the divisor of $h$ is equal to $A_1 + A_2 - A_3 - gP_0$.

We denote by $c_g$ the surjective map which assigns to a positive divisor $A$ of degree $g$ the element $c_g(A) = A - gP_0$ in $\text{Pic}_0(X)$ (cf. chapter 1).

Let $E$ be a divisor in $\text{Div}_0(X)$ whose support does not contain $P_0$. Let $S$ be a finite subgroup of $\text{Pic}_0(X)$. We suppose that $S$ has a set of representatives $\{A_s\}$ under $c_g$ which are prime to $E$. We fix such a set of representatives and define the following group law on $S \times k^*$:

$$(s_1, a_1) \circ (s_2, a_2) = (c_g(A_{s_3}), a_1a_2h(E))$$

where $A_{s_3}$ is the divisor and $h$ is the function in step (*) corresponding to $A_{s_1}$ and $A_{s_2}$; $s_3$ is the sum of $s_1$ and $s_2$ in $S$. The assumptions guarantee that $h(E)$ is a nonzero element in $k$.

**Remark:** For the theoretical background of this group law we refer to the theory of theta groups (cf. [Mu]).

**Lemma 3.1:** Let $E$ be a divisor in $\text{Div}_0(X)$ which is prime to $P_0$ and let $D \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m$; we suppose that the subgroup of $\text{Pic}_0(X)$ which is generated by $D$ has a set of representatives which are prime to $E$, the representative of 0 should be $gP_0$. Then

$$(\underbrace{D, 1 \circ \ldots \circ D, 1}_{m\text{-times}}) = (0, f(E))$$

where $f$ is the function on $X$ whose divisor is equal to $mD$.

**Proof:** Let $A_i$ be the representative of $iD$. One sees immediately that

$$(\underbrace{D, 1 \circ \ldots \circ D, 1}_{i\text{-times}}) = (iD, h_i(E))$$

where $h_i$ has the divisor $iA_1 - A_i - (i - 1)gP_0$. Since $mD = 0$ and $A_m = gP_0$, we get $h_m(E) = f(E)$. ♣

With this lemma one can evaluate $f(E)$ with $O(\log m)$ elementary operations by using repeated doubling in the group $(\langle D \rangle \times k^*, \circ)$.

**Remark:** If $g = 1$, one can use Lemma 3.1 to evaluate the Weil pairing of the elliptic curve $X$. These ideas are used in [Ka], [Mi].

Let $D \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m$ and $E \in \text{Pic}_0(X)$. In order to evaluate $f(E)$ with lemma 3.1 it is not necessary to assume that the divisor $E \in \overline{E}$ is prime to the representative of each $iD$. 10
Only those representatives are important which are used to perform the $m$-fold addition by the repeated doubling method. Hence $E$ can be chosen in $O(\log m)$ steps.

From this we get

**Proposition 3.2:** Let $D \in \text{Pic}_0(X)_m$ and $E \in \text{Pic}_0(X)$, take divisors $D \in D$ and $E \in E$ which are relatively prime, let $f$ be a function whose divisor is $mD$. Then $f(E)$ (modulo $k^{*m}$) can be evaluated in $O(\log m)$ elementary operations. ♣
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