

SPLIT DEGENERATE SUPERELLIPTIC CURVES AND ℓ -ADIC IMAGES OF INERTIA

JEFFREY YELTON

ABSTRACT. Let K be a field with a discrete valuation, and let p and ℓ be (possibly equal) primes which are not necessarily different from the residue characteristic. Given a superelliptic curve $C : y^p = f(x)$ which has split degenerate reduction over K , with Jacobian denoted by J/K , we describe the action of an element of the inertia group I_K on the ℓ -adic Tate module $T_\ell(J)$ as a product of powers of certain transvections with respect to the ℓ -adic Weil pairing and the canonical principal polarization of J . The powers to which the transvections are taken are given by a formula depending entirely on the cluster data of the roots of the defining polynomial f . This result is demonstrated using Mumford's non-archimedean uniformization of the curve C .

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K be a field which is Henselian with respect to a discrete valuation $v : K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$; let $\pi \in K$ denote a uniformizer (so that we have $v(\pi) = 1$). Let \bar{K} denote an algebraic closure of K . We write I_K for the inertia subgroup of the absolute Galois group $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$ of K . For this paper, we fix a prime p and consider a *superelliptic curve* C/K which is a p -cover of the projective line \mathbb{P}_K^1 . Our goal is to describe, for any prime ℓ , the action of a particular element of I_K on the ℓ -adic Tate module of the Jacobian of C . We develop the necessary set-up before presenting our main result as Theorem 1.3 in §1.3 below.

1.1. Superelliptic curves, their Jacobians, and the associated ℓ -adic Galois actions. The type of superelliptic curve we are interested in is a smooth projective curve determined by the affine model given by an equation of the form

$$(1) \quad C : y^p = f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^d (x - z_i)^{r_i},$$

where $f(x) \in K[x]$ is a polynomial of degree d and we have $1 \leq r_i \leq p - 1$. (In the special case that $p = 2$, the curve C is *hyperelliptic*, and the polynomial f is squarefree.) The set \mathcal{B} of branch points of the degree- p map $x : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^1$ coincides with $\{z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d}$ (resp. $\{z_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq d} \cup \{\infty\}$) if we have $p \mid d$ (resp. $p \nmid d$). For simplicity, we assume throughout this paper that the polynomial f is monic of degree not divisible by p and that its roots z_i of f all lie in K , noting that, given an equation of the form (1) such a model can always be obtained after replacing K with a finite algebraic extension, applying a fractional linear transformation to x that moves one of the branch points to ∞ , and applying an appropriate transformation to y . In this case, one can easily compute from the Riemann-Hurwitz formula that the genus g of C is given by $g = \frac{1}{2}(p - 1)(d - 1)$.

Throughout this paper, for any group variety G/K and integer $m \geq 1$, we write $G[m]$ for the m -torsion subgroup of $G(\bar{K})$. We denote the Jacobian variety of C by J ; it is an abelian variety over K of dimension g . For each prime ℓ , we let $T_\ell(J) := \varprojlim_{\leftarrow n} J[\ell^n]$ denote the ℓ -adic Tate module of J ; it is a free \mathbb{Z}_ℓ -module of rank $2g$. We write

$$\rho_\ell : \text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$$

for the natural ℓ -adic Galois action on this Tate module. We write J^\vee for the dual abelian variety of J and $T_\ell(J^\vee)$ for its ℓ -adic Tate module. The Jacobian variety J is equipped with the canonical

principal polarization $J \xrightarrow{\sim} J^\vee$, which induces an isomorphism $T_\ell(J) \xrightarrow{\sim} T_\ell(J^\vee)$ of ℓ -adic Tate modules. We have the *Weil pairing* given by

$$\mathbf{e}_\ell : T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(J^\vee) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times) := \varprojlim_{\leftarrow n} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell^n}$$

(where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell^n}$ denotes the group of ℓ^n th roots of unity); it is a Galois-equivariant \mathbb{Z}_ℓ -bilinear pairing. On composing with the aforementioned isomorphism $T_\ell(J) \xrightarrow{\sim} T_\ell(J^\vee)$ on the second argument, this gives us the Galois-equivariant \mathbb{Z}_ℓ -bilinear skew-symmetric pairing

$$e_\ell : T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(J) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times).$$

For each integer $n \geq 0$, we fix a primitive n th root of unity denoted by ζ_n , and we choose these roots of unity so that $\zeta_{mn}^m = \zeta_n$ for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We make the additional assumption throughout this paper that we have $\zeta_p \in K$. The curve C then has an order- p automorphism over K which respects its degree- p map onto \mathbb{P}_K^1 and which is given by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \zeta_p y)$. This induces an order- p K -automorphism of the Jacobian J , which we also denote by ζ_p and which realizes an embedding of the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p]$ into the K -endomorphism ring of J . In turn, the automorphism ζ_p of J acts on the ℓ -adic Tate module $T_\ell(J)$. We denote the resulting automorphism again by $\zeta_p \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$; in fact, this realizes $T_\ell(J)$ as a $\mathbb{Z}_\ell[\zeta_p]$ -module. (See [9] for more details.)

For any element $\mathfrak{w} \in T_\ell(J)$, we denote by $t_{\mathfrak{w}} \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ the *transvection* with respect to \mathfrak{w} , given by $t_{\mathfrak{w}} : \mathfrak{v} \mapsto \mathfrak{v} + e_\ell(\mathfrak{v}, \mathfrak{w})\mathfrak{w}$, where we are viewing e_ℓ as taking values in the additive group \mathbb{Z}_ℓ via the obvious group isomorphism $T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Z}_\ell$.

In [23, §2], the author used topological methods to describe the image in $\text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ of an element of I_K as a product of transvections under certain hypotheses in the hyperelliptic case when $p = 2$ is different from the residue characteristic of K : [23, Proposition 2.6] describes this image of inertia as being generated by a power of a single transvection under a particular hypothesis on the geometry of the roots z_i , but it is implicit from the results of [23, §2] that, replacing the hypothesis that, under the weaker hypothesis that the only proper non-singleton *clusters* (see Definition 1.1 below) have even cardinality, the image of inertia is generated by a product of powers of (commuting) transvections with respect to elements of $T_\ell(J)$ which each correspond to one of these clusters. The object of this paper is to prove a generalization of this for superelliptic curves, under the new hypothesis that the curve satisfy a condition called *split degenerate reduction*, but without any restriction on the residue characteristic of K .

1.2. Split degenerate superelliptic curves and cluster data. A curve C of genus g is said to have *split degenerate reduction* over K if it has a semistable model over the ring of integers of K whose special fiber consists only of components which are each isomorphic to the projective line over the residue field. There are several equivalent formulations for this condition on the special fiber of a semistable model of C , one of them being that the graph of components of its special fiber has g loops, which in turn is equivalent to saying that this special fiber has (maximal) toric rank g . By definition, this last condition means that identity component $(\mathcal{J}_s)_0$ of the special fiber of the Néron model \mathcal{J} of the Jacobian J is an split torus (of rank g) over the residue field; in other words, the resulting abelian variety J has *split toric reduction*.

When a superelliptic curve C has split degenerate reduction, we can say more about the form of the equation (1) used to define the curve. Letting $h = \frac{r-1}{2} = \frac{g}{p-1}$, by [20, Proposition 3.1(a)], we may label the roots of the defining polynomial f as $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_h, \beta_h$ in such a way that C has an equation of the form

$$(2) \quad y^p = (x - \alpha_0)^{m_0} \prod_{i=1}^h (x - \alpha_i)^{m_i} (x - \beta_i)^{p-m_i}$$

for some integers m_i each satisfying $1 \leq m_i \leq p - m_i$. Letting $\beta_0 = \infty$, the set \mathcal{B} of branch points of the map $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^1$ is then given by $\{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq h}$.

In fact, we can say more regarding the *clustering* of this set of branch points. In order to express this, we introduce the language of *clusters* and *cluster data*, following its use in [7]. (In the following definition and elsewhere below, we use the notation \mathbb{P}_L^1 for the set $L \cup \{\infty\}$ for any extension L/K .)

Definition 1.1. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ be a finite subset. A subset $\mathfrak{s} \subseteq A$ is called a cluster (of A) if there is some subset $D \subset K$ which is a disc under the metric induced by the valuation $v : K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathfrak{s} = A \cap D$. The depth of a non-singleton cluster \mathfrak{s} is the integer*

$$(3) \quad d(\mathfrak{s}) := \min_{z, z' \in \mathfrak{s}, z \neq z'} v(z - z').$$

Given any two clusters $\mathfrak{s}_1, \mathfrak{s}_2 \subset A$, we denote by $\mathfrak{s}_1 \vee \mathfrak{s}_2$ the smallest cluster which contains both \mathfrak{s}_1 and \mathfrak{s}_2 (it is easy to show that such a cluster always exists).

In our context, the set A is the set of branch points $\mathfrak{B} = \{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq h}$. For $1 \leq i \leq h$, we write \mathfrak{s}_i for the smallest cluster containing both α_i and β_i (noting that we have $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in K$).

Definition 1.2. *We say that a cluster $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{B}$ is \ddot{u} bereven if it satisfies the property that, for each cluster \mathfrak{c} which is not the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters, we have*

$$(4) \quad d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{c}) - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}) > \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}.$$

(In particular, an \ddot{u} bereven cluster itself is the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters.)

From now on, let \mathfrak{C} denote the set of non-singleton clusters of \mathfrak{B} which either are \ddot{u} bereven or are not the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters, and let $\mathfrak{C}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$ be the subset consisting of those clusters with even cardinality.

1.3. Main result. We are now ready to present our main result, which describes a symplectic automorphism of the ℓ -adic Tate module $T_\ell(J)$ which is in the image of inertia.

Theorem 1.3. *Let C be a split degenerate superelliptic curve over K which is determined by an equation of the form (2). For any subset $\mathfrak{E} \subseteq \mathfrak{C}$, let $u_{\mathfrak{E}} \in \{0, \dots, \#\mathfrak{E}\}$ denote the number of clusters in \mathfrak{E} which are \ddot{u} bereven. Given a cluster $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$, among all clusters $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}$ satisfying $d(\mathfrak{s}) - d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}) > (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$, let \mathfrak{s}' be one which minimizes the value $d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{c}) - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{c}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ (such a cluster exists and is unique by Corollary 3.10 below). Let*

$$(5) \quad m_{\mathfrak{s}} = d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{s}') - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \tilde{\mathfrak{s}}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}.$$

Choose a prime ℓ . Let $\sigma \in I_K$ be a Galois automorphism which, for each integer $m \geq 0$, fixes all m th roots in \bar{K} of elements of K of valuation 0 and maps any m th root $\pi^{1/m}$ of any uniformizer π of K to $\zeta_m \pi^{1/m}$. There is a $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p]_\ell := \lim_{\leftarrow n} \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p] / \ell^n \mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p]$ -submodule $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$, which coincides with the submodule $T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$ of elements fixed by inertia in the case that ℓ is not the residue characteristic, with a $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p]_\ell$ -basis $\{\mathfrak{v}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{v}_h\}$ such that the action of σ on $T_\ell(J)$ is given by

$$(6) \quad \rho_\ell(\sigma) = \prod_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0} \left(\prod_{0 \leq n \leq p-1} t_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}}^{m_{\mathfrak{s}}} \right).$$

For the formula above, we define $\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}} = \sum_i \mathfrak{v}_i \in T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$, with the sum taken over all i such that we have $\mathfrak{s}_i \subseteq \mathfrak{s}$ and do not have $\mathfrak{s}_i \subsetneq \mathfrak{s}_l \subseteq \mathfrak{s}$ for any $l \neq i$.

Moreover, if $\ell = p$, the modulo- p image of the element $(\zeta_p + 2\zeta_p^2 + \dots + (p-1)\zeta_p^{p-1})\mathfrak{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$ is the p -torsion point of $J(K)$ represented by a multiple¹ of the divisor $\sum_j m_j((\alpha_j, 0) - (\beta_j, 0)) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$, where the sum is taken over all indices j satisfying $d(\mathfrak{s}_i) - d(\mathfrak{s}_i \vee \mathfrak{s}_j) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ and m_j is the exponent appearing in (2).

¹Corollary 7.2 below specifies that the integer multiplier is 1 when $\zeta_p \in \text{Aut}(C)$ is defined as in §2.2.

Remark 1.4. One sees that an automorphism $\sigma \in I_K$ with the properties specified in the statement of Theorem 1.3 exists by the theory of Kummer extensions on observing that the multiplicative group K^\times is generated over its subgroup of valuation-0 elements by π . If ℓ is not the residue characteristic of K , the image of the element σ in the maximal pro- ℓ quotient of I_K topologically generates this quotient, and the image $\rho_\ell(\sigma) \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ generates the ℓ -adic image of inertia.

Remark 1.5. It follows from Remark 5.4 below that the pairing e_ℓ restricted to the submodule $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$ is trivial. One checks as an elementary exercise that for any pair of elements $\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}' \in T_\ell(J)$, the transvections $t_{\mathfrak{w}}$ and $t_{\mathfrak{w}'}$ commute if and only if $e_\ell(\mathfrak{w}, \mathfrak{w}')$ is trivial. It follows that the transvections in the product in (6) commute, and so that product as written is well defined.

Remark 1.6. In particular cases, the conclusion of the above theorem becomes considerably simpler. We point out several of these below. For these examples, we define the *parent cluster* of a cluster \mathfrak{s} to be the smallest cluster properly containing \mathfrak{s} , if one exists; in this situation, we write $\delta(\mathfrak{s})$ for the depth of \mathfrak{s} minus the depth of its parent.

- (a) Suppose that p is not the residue characteristic of K . Then all clusters which are the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters are *übereven*; the set \mathfrak{C} consists of all non-singleton clusters; and one can show without much difficulty that for each cluster $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$, the cluster \mathfrak{s}' is just the parent of \mathfrak{s} . Then the formula for $m_{\mathfrak{s}}$ becomes much simpler: we get $m_{\mathfrak{s}} = \delta(\mathfrak{s})$.
- (b) Suppose instead that no cluster of \mathfrak{B} is a union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters, so that in particular there are no *übereven* clusters. Then one sees using Proposition 3.8(c) below that the set \mathfrak{C}_0 consists only of the clusters $\mathfrak{s}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{s}_h$, which comprise all of the even-cardinality clusters. Moreover, as in part (a), for $1 \leq i \leq h$, the cluster \mathfrak{s}'_i is just the parent of \mathfrak{s}_i . The main conclusion of Theorem 1.3 now simplifies to stating that

$$(7) \quad \rho_\ell(\sigma) = \prod_{i=1}^h \left(\prod_{0 \leq n \leq p-1} t_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{v}_i}^{r_i} \right),$$

with $r_i = \delta(\mathfrak{s}_i) - \frac{2pv(p)}{p-1}$.

- (c) Finally, we consider the hyperelliptic case (where $p = 2$). Noting that (as an elementary property of transvections) for any $v \in T_\ell(J)$, we have $t_{-v} = t_v$, we may rewrite (6) as

$$(8) \quad \rho_\ell(\sigma) = \prod_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0} t_{\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}}^{2m_{\mathfrak{s}}}.$$

Moreover, if we assume that the residue characteristic of K is not 2, then we even get

$$(9) \quad \rho_\ell(\sigma) = \prod_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0} t_{\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}}^{2\delta(\mathfrak{s}) - (4-2u_{\mathfrak{s}})v(2)},$$

where $u_{\mathfrak{s}}$ is now just the number of clusters among \mathfrak{s} and its parent \mathfrak{s}' which are themselves the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters.

If we further assume that $\ell = 2$, the statement of Theorem 1.3(a) says that the image of each element $\mathfrak{v}_i \in T_2(J)$ is represented by the divisor $(\alpha_i, 0) - (\beta_i, 0) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$. The result for this last special case can also be shown from the results of [23, §2], although the analog appearing as [23, Proposition 2.6] applies not to the situation of split degenerate reduction (unless $g = 1$) but to the case of only one proper non-singleton cluster, that cluster having cardinality 2.

- (d) We finally mention that if we further assume that $C : y^2 = (x - \alpha_0)(x - \alpha_1)(x - \beta_1)$ is an elliptic curve with split multiplicative reduction over K , then the only cluster in \mathfrak{C}_0 is $\mathfrak{s}_1 = \{\alpha_1, \beta_1\}$. One may compute using [18, Proposition 1.7(b)] that the j -invariant $j(C)$ satisfies $v(j(C)) = 8v(2) - 2\delta(\mathfrak{s}_1)$; in particular, as the multiplicative reduction property implies $v(j(C)) < 0$, we get $\delta(\mathfrak{s}_1) > 4v(2)$. (One can even show this independently by

applying Theorem 3.4 to this special case.) Now we simply get that \mathbf{v}_1 reduces modulo 2 to the order-2 divisor class represented by $(\alpha_1, 0) - (\beta_1, 0) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$ and

$$(10) \quad \rho_\ell(\sigma) = t_{\mathbf{v}_1}^{2\delta(s_1) - 8v(2)} = t_{\mathbf{v}_1}^{-j(C)}.$$

Apart from the explicit description of the modulo-2 image of \mathbf{v}_i , this can be more or less deduced from [17, Exercise 5.13(b)]. But knowing the modulo-2 image of \mathbf{v}_i allows us to apply this result to a global setting using the methods of [23, §3,4] and for instance to strengthen the result given in Example 4.3 of that paper (in which $\alpha_0 := 1, \alpha_1 := 0, \beta_1 := \lambda$ lie in a global ground field L) to one that allows for either of the prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_1 \mid (\lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{p}_2 \mid (\lambda - 1)$ of \mathcal{O}_L to have residue characteristic 2. We expect that one may be able to use Theorem 1.3 to pave the way toward similar results in a global setting for $g \geq 2$ or $p \geq 3$.

1.4. Outline of the paper. In §2, we provide the necessary background on non-archimedean uniformization of split degenerate curves (as a subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ modulo the action of a subgroup $\Gamma < \text{PGL}_2(K)$ with certain properties) and of their Jacobians (as a torus $T := \text{Hom}(\Gamma, K^\times)$ modulo a lattice $\Lambda := \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ generated by certain characters c_γ defined there), emphasizing particular properties that hold when the curve is superelliptic. We also discuss the dual $J^\vee \cong T^\vee/\Lambda^\vee$ of such a Jacobian $J \cong T/\Lambda$ as well as the Weil pairings of J with J^\vee , culminating in an explicit description of the Weil pairing given by Proposition 2.4. In §3 we develop the necessary background theory on viewing the set \mathcal{B} through certain subspaces of the Berkovich projective line $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{\text{an}}$. The goal of §4 is then to build on the set-up established in §3 to get an explicit formula (given as Theorem 4.7) for the pairing $(\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(c_\gamma(\gamma'))$; this is done with respect to a convenient basis and therefore provides the valuations of the entries of a *period matrix* of the lattice Λ defining the Jacobian. We then proceed in §5 to associate unipotent operators in $\text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ to pairings of $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ with $\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$, showing (as Proposition 5.2) that the pairing associated to $\rho_\ell(\sigma)$ is the same as $(\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(c_\gamma(\gamma'))$, and providing (as Proposition 5.7) formulas for the pairings associated to transvections with respect to certain elements of $T_\ell(J)$. In §6, we use our formulas for pairings established in §4 and §5 to show that the automorphism $\rho_\ell(\sigma)$ is equal to the product of transvections claimed by Theorem 1.3. We finish the paper with §7, which strengthens the results of [22, §1] and proves the last claim of Theorem 1.3 (concerning each generator \mathbf{v}_i in the $\ell = p$ case).

1.5. Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Yaacov Kopeliovich for useful discussions on non-archimedean uniformization of Jacobians and in particular for pointing him towards the article [22], enabling him to produce the results of §7.

2. BACKGROUND ON NON-ARCHIMEDEAN UNIFORMIZATION OF CURVES AND THEIR JACOBIANS

This section lays out all of the necessary background information on the uniformization of curves in the non-archimedean setting and the construction of their Jacobians as analytic tori, as well more explicit background results in the special case of superelliptic curves. Our main sources of the theory of non-archimedean uniformization for general curves (with split degenerate reduction) and their Jacobians are [10, Chapters III, IV, VI] and [15, §6, 7], while our main source regarding the superelliptic case [20] and [22]; many more details can be found in these sources. (Our definition of theta functions follows the formula given in [10, §II.2] and [22] rather than in [8] or [15, §7].)

2.1. Schottky groups and non-archimedean uniformization of split degenerate curves. Mumford showed in his groundbreaking paper [13] that any curve C/K (not necessarily superelliptic) of genus $g \geq 1$ can be realized as a quotient of a certain subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ by the action of a free subgroup $\Gamma < \text{PGL}_2(K)$ of g generators via fractional linear transformations if and only if the the curve C has split degenerate reduction. The free subgroup $\Gamma < \text{PGL}_2(K)$ must act discontinuously on \mathbb{P}_K^1 (*i.e.* the set of limit points under its action must not coincide with all of \mathbb{P}_K^1), and the subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ such that C can be uniformized as the quotient Ω/Γ coincides with the set

of non-limit points. Such a subgroup $\Gamma < \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ is called a *Schottky group*. This main result on non-archimedean uniformization of curves is given as [13, Theorem 4.20] and [10, Theorems III.2.2, III.2.12.2, and IV.3.10]. We comment that in the special case of $g = 1$, after applying an appropriate automorphism of \mathbb{P}_K^1 we get $\Omega = \mathbb{P}_K^1 \setminus \{0, \infty\} = K^\times$ and that the Schottky group Γ is generated by the fractional linear transformation $z \mapsto qz$ for some element $q \in K^\times$ of positive valuation, and thus we recover the Tate uniformization $C \cong K^\times / \langle q \rangle$ established in [19].

It is shown in [10, §9.2] and [21, §1] (for the $p = 2$ case) and in [20, §2] (for general p) that given a prime p and a split degenerate curve C/K of genus $g = (p-1)h$ realized as such a quotient Ω/Γ , the curve C is superelliptic and a degree- p cover of \mathbb{P}_K^1 if and only if Γ is normally contained in a larger subgroup $\Gamma_0 < \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ generated by $h+1$ elements s_0, \dots, s_h whose only relations are $s_0^p = \dots = s_h^p = 1$. In this situation, the Schottky group is given by

$$(11) \quad \Gamma = \langle \gamma_{i,0,n} := s_0^{n-1} s_i s_0^{-n} \rangle_{1 \leq i \leq h, 1 \leq n \leq p-1}.$$

It is an elementary group-theoretic exercise to show from these definitions that the generators $\gamma_{i,0,n}$ of Γ satisfy no group relations and that we have $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0$ and $[\Gamma : \Gamma_0] = p$. (This implies in particular that Ω is the set of non-limit points under the action of Γ_0 as well.) In fact, it turns out that we have $\Omega/\Gamma_0 \cong \mathbb{P}_K^1$ so that the natural surjection $\Omega/\Gamma \twoheadrightarrow \Omega/\Gamma_0$ is just the degree- p covering map $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^1$.

As each element $s_i \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \Gamma$ has order p and normalizes Γ , it induces an order- p automorphism on the quotient $C \cong \Omega/\Gamma$ which respects the covering map $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_K^1 \cong \Omega/\Gamma_0$, by sending the image modulo Γ of each point $z \in \Omega$ to the image modulo Γ of $s_i(z) \in \Omega$. It follows from the easily-verified fact that we have $s_j s_i^{-1} \in \Gamma$ that this automorphism of C does not depend on the index i . The group of such automorphisms of C is generated by the order- p automorphism given by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \zeta_p y)$; let us now assume that the primitive root ζ_p has been chosen such that each s_i induces this automorphism. It is then shown as [20, Proposition 3.2] that for $0 \leq i \leq h$, there is a matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ representing the element $s_i \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ which is similar to $\begin{bmatrix} \zeta_p^{n_i} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, where n_i is an integer such that $m_i n_i \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ (with m_i the exponent appearing in (2)).

Each order- p element $s_i \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ fixes exactly 2 points of \mathbb{P}_K^1 , which we denote by a_i and b_i . One can show that we have $a_i, b_i \in \Omega$ for $0 \leq i \leq h$ (see for instance [25, Corollary 4.3]). Writing $S = \{a_0, b_0, \dots, a_h, b_h\} \subset \Omega$, it is easy to verify that the set-theoretic image of S modulo the action of the group Γ_0 coincides with the set of branch points $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1 \cong \Omega/\Gamma_0$. By [20, Proposition 3.1(a)], for $0 \leq i \leq h$, each of the branch points $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathcal{B}$ as defined in §1.1 is respectively the image of the element $a_i, b_i \in \Omega$ after possibly permuting the indices and permuting a_i, b_i for a fixed index i .

2.2. Non-archimedean uniformization of Jacobians of split degenerate curves. The discussion in this and the next subsection applies to any split degenerate curve C/K , regardless of whether it is superelliptic. In order to analytically construct the Jacobian of a split degenerate curve, it is necessary to define a certain kind of automorphic form on Ω ; proofs for the properties of these automorphic forms stated in the following discussion can be found in [10, §II.2.3].

As in §2.1, let $\Gamma < \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ be the Schottky group used to uniformize the split degenerate curve C , and write $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ for the subset of limit points of the action of Γ . For any choice of $a, b \in \Omega$ not both in the Γ -orbit of ∞ , we define the *theta function* $\Theta_{a,b}$ (with respect to $a, b \in \Omega$ and to $\Gamma < \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$) as

$$\Theta_{a,b}(z) = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{z - \gamma(a)}{z - \gamma(b)}.$$

We adopt the convention that if exactly one of the terms in the numerator (resp. denominator) is ∞ , then the numerator (resp. denominator) is replaced by 1 and that if the denominator comes out to 0, then the infinite product equals $\infty \in \mathbb{P}_K^1$. It is easy to see that as long as we have $b \notin \Gamma a$,

the set of zeros (resp. poles) of $\Theta_{a,b}$ coincides with $\{\gamma(a_i)\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ (resp. $\{\gamma(b_i)\}_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$), whereas if on the other hand we have $b \in \Gamma a$, then the function $\Theta_{a,b}$ has no zeros or poles.

One can show that any theta function with respect to Γ is well-defined and meromorphic on Ω and moreover that it has an automorphy property: for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, there is an element $c_{a,b}(\gamma) \in K^\times$ such that we have

$$(12) \quad \Theta_{a,b}(\gamma(z)) = c_{a,b}(\gamma)\Theta_{a,b}(z).$$

(We note that the formula for the automorphy factor $c_{a,b} \in K^\times$ in most sources defines it as the multiplicative inverse of the factor we have defined above.) It is clear that the mapping $\gamma \mapsto c_{a,b}(\gamma)$ respects group multiplication and so defines a homomorphism $c_{a,b} : \Gamma \rightarrow K^\times$. Since the target group is abelian, in fact the homomorphism $c_{a,b}$ factors through the abelianization $\bar{\Gamma} \cong \mathbb{Z}^g$ of Γ ; abusing notation slightly, we denote the resulting homomorphism again by $c_{a,b} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow K^\times$.

Moreover, for any $\gamma \in \Gamma$, one can show that the function $c_{a,\gamma(a)}$ does not depend on the choice of an element $a \in \Omega$; we denote this function by c_γ . It is clear that we have $c_{\gamma\gamma'} \equiv c_\gamma c_{\gamma'}$ for any $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$; therefore, the set $\Lambda := \{c_\gamma \mid \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ forms a group of homomorphisms from $\bar{\Gamma}$ to K^\times . Below we will often abuse notation slightly by writing c_γ for the homomorphism $\bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow K^\times$ defined as above with respect to an element of Γ but in a context where γ refers not to that element of Γ but to its reduction in $\bar{\Gamma}$.

The full homomorphism group $\text{Hom}(\bar{\Gamma}, K^\times)$ is isomorphic to $(K^\times)^g$ and so has the structure of a split analytic torus over K which we denote by T (see [8, Corollary 2 to Theorem 4] or [10, §VI.1]). The subgroup $\Lambda < T$ defined above is a rank- g lattice. The quotient T/Λ can be identified with (the analytification of) the Jacobian J/K by defining an K -analytic Abel-Jacobi map as follows. Any degree-0 K -divisor can be written as $\sum_{i=1}^s ((P_i) - (Q_i))$ for some $s \geq 0$ and some (not necessarily distinct) points $P_i, Q_i \in C(\bar{K})$ such that the above formal sum is fixed by $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$. For $1 \leq i \leq s$, choose elements $p_i, q_i \in \Omega(\bar{K}) := \Omega \cup (\bar{K} \setminus K)$ mapping respectively to $P_i, Q_i \in C(\bar{K}) \cong \Omega(\bar{K})/\Gamma$ under reduction modulo the action of Γ . Then we define the K -analytic Abel-Jacobi map

$$(13) \quad \text{AJ} : \text{Div}_0(C) \rightarrow T, \quad \sum_{i=1}^s ((P_i) - (Q_i)) \mapsto \prod_{i=1}^s c_{p_i, q_i}.$$

It is shown in [8, §3.4] and [10, §VI.1] that this map AJ is surjective (and sends K -divisors in $\text{Div}_0(C)$ to K -points of T) and that the image of the subgroup $\text{Prin}(C) < \text{Div}_0(C)$ of principal divisors under AJ coincides with the lattice $\Lambda < T$. In this way, the map AJ induces an isomorphism $\text{Pic}_0(C) \xrightarrow{\sim} T/\Lambda$ and thus identifies the quotient T/Λ with the Jacobian J of C .

Although the above construction describes the Jacobian variety J as a multiplicative group, we will use additive notation for points of J .

As in §1.1, we denote by $\zeta_p \in \text{End}(J)$ the automorphism of J induced from the automorphism of C given by $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \zeta_p y)$. If we retain our assumption from §2.1 that ζ_p is chosen so that this automorphism of C is induced by the element $s_i \in \Gamma_0$ for some (any) index i , then we may explicitly describe the automorphism $\zeta_p \in \text{End}(J)$ as follows.

Proposition 2.1. *For some (any) index i , the automorphism $\zeta_p \in \text{End}(J)$ is the one induced by the automorphism of T which acts on each homomorphism $\Gamma \rightarrow K^\times$ in $T(K)$ by composing it with the conjugation map $s_i(\cdot) : \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma$ given by $\gamma \mapsto s_i \gamma s_i^{-1}$.*

Proof. Since the group $J(K)$ is generated by equivalence classes of divisors of the form $(P) - (Q) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$, it follows from the above construction of the Jacobian that it suffices to verify the claimed description of the action of $\zeta_p \in \text{End}(J)$ on images modulo Λ of elements of T of the form $c_{a,b}$ for $a, b \in \Omega$. By considering the pullback of the divisor $(P) - (Q)$ via the automorphism $(x, y) \mapsto (x, \zeta_p y)$ of C , the automorphism ζ_p sends $c_{a,b}$ to $c_{s_i^{-1}(a), s_i^{-1}(b)}$.

Now, using Lemma 7.3 below to get a constant $c \in K^\times$, we get

$$(14) \quad c_{s_i^{-1}(a), s_i^{-1}(b)}(\gamma) \equiv \frac{\Theta_{s_i^{-1}(a), s_i^{-1}(b)}(\gamma(z))}{\Theta_{s_i^{-1}(a), s_i^{-1}(b)}(z)} \equiv \frac{c^{-1}\Theta_{a,b}([s_i\gamma](z))}{c^{-1}\Theta_{a,b}(s_i(z))} \equiv \frac{\Theta_{a,b}([s_i\gamma s_i^{-1}](s_i(z)))}{\Theta_{a,b}(s_i(z))} \equiv c_{a,b}(s_i\gamma s_i^{-1}).$$

□

2.3. Duals and Weil pairings for split toric Jacobians. Let T^\vee denote the group $\text{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{G}_m)$ of characters of the lattice Λ , and let Λ^\vee denote the group $\text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$ of characters of the torus T , where *characters* are understood to be morphisms of group varieties; we may view both T^\vee and Λ^\vee as rigid analytic group varieties over K . There is an obvious map $\Lambda^\vee \rightarrow T^\vee$ given by restriction of characters to $\Lambda \subset T$. One can see, as in the discussion in [5, §2], that this realizes Λ^\vee as a lattice in T^\vee of maximal rank, and it is shown as [5, Theorem 2.1] that the resulting quotient T^\vee/Λ^\vee may be identified with the dual J^\vee of the abelian variety J .

Remark 2.2. Let L/K be an algebraic extension. Any element $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}$ induces an element $\text{ev}_\gamma \in \Lambda^\vee(L) = \text{Hom}(T_L, \mathbb{G}_{m,L})$ mapping a point $\mu \in T(L)$, viewed as a homomorphism $\chi_\mu : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow L^\times$, to its evaluation $\chi_\mu(\gamma) \in L^\times$. One checks that the mapping $\gamma \mapsto \text{ev}_\gamma$ is injective and surjective and thus allows us to identify the lattice Λ_L^\vee with the free \mathbb{Z} -module $\bar{\Gamma}$, an identification that we will make freely below.

For any algebraic extension L/K and an L -point μ of T^\vee (resp. (K) -point of Λ^\vee), we write $\chi_\mu : \Lambda \rightarrow L^\times$ (resp. $\chi_\mu : T \rightarrow K^\times$) for the corresponding character. Thanks to Remark 2.2, each L -point λ of T (resp. (K) -point of Λ) can similarly be viewed as a character on Λ^\vee (resp. T^\vee) taking values in L^\times (resp. K^\times), and we write χ_λ for this character. (Note that we have $\chi_\lambda(\mu) = \chi_\mu(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\mu \in \Lambda^\vee$.)

Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer. By applying the functor $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}, \cdot)$ to the short exact sequence

$$(15) \quad 1 \rightarrow \Lambda \rightarrow T \rightarrow J \rightarrow 1$$

and observing that Λ , being a free \mathbb{Z} -module, has trivial torsion, we get an injection $T[m] \hookrightarrow J[m]$. Similarly, we get an injection $T^\vee[m] \hookrightarrow J^\vee[m]$. We write $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_m$ and $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_m^\vee$ for the images of $T[m]$ and $T^\vee[m]$ under these respective injections, making them respectively rank- g $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ -submodules of the rank- $2g$ $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ -modules $J[m]$ and $J^\vee[m]$. Now letting $m = \ell^n$ be a power of a prime ℓ and taking inverse limits gives us injections of free \mathbb{Z}_ℓ -modules

$$(16) \quad \mathbb{T}_\ell := T_\ell(T) := \lim_{\leftarrow n} T[\ell^n] \hookrightarrow T_\ell(J), \quad \mathbb{T}_\ell^\vee := T_\ell(T^\vee) := \lim_{\leftarrow n} T^\vee[\ell^n] \hookrightarrow T_\ell(J^\vee).$$

Remark 2.3. Suppose that m is prime to the residue characteristic of K . Then since all m -power roots of unity in \bar{K} are fixed by the inertia subgroup I_K , the submodule $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_m \subset J[m]$ is contained in the submodule $J[m]^{I_K} \subset J[m]$ fixed by the action of inertia. On taking inverse limits, it follows that we have the similar inclusion $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subseteq T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$ for any ℓ different from the residue characteristic.

One can show from the fact that J has split toric reduction, using Grothendieck's Orthogonality Theorem ([11, Théorème 2.4]), that the ranks of $T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$ and $T_\ell(J^\vee)^{I_K}$ must both equal g , using the following argument. The fact that the abelian variety J is split toric implies that its dual abelian variety J^\vee is as well. Grothendieck's Orthogonality Theorem states that the submodule $T_\ell(J)^t \subset T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$ mapping to the toric part of the identity component of the special fiber of the Néron model of J and the submodule $T_\ell(J^\vee)^{I_K} \subset T_\ell(J^\vee)$ are orthogonal complements to each other with respect to the Weil pairing $\epsilon_\ell : T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(J^\vee) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)$. As the rank of $T_\ell(J)^t$ is g , the rank of its orthogonal complement $T_\ell(J^\vee)^{I_K}$ is $2g - g = g$, and by a symmetric argument, the rank of $T_\ell(J)^{I_K}$ is g as well. We may therefore make the identifications $\mathbb{T}_\ell = T_\ell(J)^{I_K} = T_\ell(J)^t$ and $\mathbb{T}_\ell^\vee = T_\ell(J^\vee)^{I_K} = T_\ell(J^\vee)^t$. We then have that $T_\ell(T)$ and $T_\ell(T^\vee)$ are orthogonal complements to each other under the pairing ϵ_ℓ ; this is implicit in Proposition 2.4 below, which generalizes this fact to the case that ℓ is the residue characteristic.

For any integer $m \geq 1$, there is a homomorphism $\bar{\phi}_m : J[m] \rightarrow \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ given by lifting an element $z \in J[m]$ to a point $\tilde{z} \in T_{\bar{K}}$ and mapping it to the reduction of $\tilde{z}^m \in \Lambda$ modulo m th powers of elements of Λ . This map $\bar{\phi}_m$ is clearly well defined, and its kernel coincides with $T[m] \subset J[m]$. Meanwhile, we may make the identifications $T^\vee[m] = \text{Hom}(\Lambda, \boldsymbol{\mu}_m) = \text{Hom}(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}, \boldsymbol{\mu}_m)$. This allows us to define a pairing

$$(17) \quad J[m] \times T^\vee[m] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_m, \quad (z, \xi) \mapsto (\chi_\xi \circ \bar{\phi}_m)(z),$$

Now, letting $m = \ell^n$ and taking inverse limits, we get a homomorphism $\phi_\ell : T_\ell(J) \rightarrow \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ whose kernel coincides with \mathbb{T}_ℓ , an identification $\mathbb{T}_\ell = T_\ell(T^\vee) = \text{Hom}(\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times))$, and the pairing

$$(18) \quad T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(T^\vee) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times), \quad (z, \xi) \mapsto (\chi_\xi \circ \phi_\ell)(z).$$

The fact that the pairings in (17) and (18) are respectively explicit formulations of certain restrictions of the Weil pairings $\bar{\epsilon}_m$ and ϵ_ℓ is more or less asserted in [6, Proof of Theorem 2.1] (as well as in [15, Proof of Theorem 5.8]) without justification provided; for the sake of completeness, it is given as Corollary 2.5 below. The following proposition provides a formula for the mod- m Weil pairing on all of $J[m] \times J^\vee[m]$.

Proposition 2.4. *Given an integer $m \geq 1$, the mod- m Weil pairing $\bar{\epsilon}_m : J[m] \times J^\vee[m] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_m$ is given by the following formula. Given an element $z \in J[m]$ (resp. $\xi \in J^\vee[m]$), choose a lifting $\tilde{z} \in T(\bar{K})$ (resp. $\tilde{\xi} \in T^\vee(\bar{K}) = \text{Hom}(\Lambda, \bar{K}^\times)$) and note that we have $\tilde{z}^m \in \Lambda$ (resp. $\tilde{\xi}^m \in \Lambda^\vee = \text{Hom}(T, K^\times)$). Then we have*

$$(19) \quad \bar{\epsilon}_m(z, \xi) = \frac{\chi_{\tilde{\xi}}(\tilde{z}^m)}{\chi_{\tilde{\xi}^m}(\tilde{z})}.$$

Proof. In [5, Proof of Theorem 2.1], in which the dual J^\vee of the split toric abelian variety J is constructed as T^\vee/Λ^\vee , any L -point $\xi \in J^\vee(L)$ (where L/K is an algebraic extension) is identified with the line bundle \mathcal{L} on J given by the trivial line bundle $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} := T \times \mathbb{A}^1$ of the torus T modulo the action of Λ given by

$$(20) \quad \lambda : (\tilde{w}, a) \mapsto (\lambda\tilde{w}, \chi_{\tilde{\xi}}(\lambda)a), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda, \tilde{w} \in T, a \in \mathbb{A}^1,$$

where $\tilde{\xi} \in T^\vee(L) = \text{Hom}(\Lambda, L^\times)$ is a lifting of ξ (one checks that choosing a different lifting $\tilde{\xi}'$ of ξ leads to an isomorphic line bundle on J using the fact that the quotient $\tilde{\xi}'/\tilde{\xi} \in \Lambda^\vee = \text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m)$ yields the global section $\chi_{\tilde{\xi}'/\tilde{\xi}}$ of T). Let $[m]$ denote the m th-power endomorphism on T or on J .

We construct the pullback line bundle $[m]^*\mathcal{L}$ on J by pulling back the trivial bundle $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = T \times \mathbb{A}^1$ via the map $[m] : T \rightarrow T$ and defining an action of Λ on $[m]^*\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ which is compatible under the m th power map $[m]$ with the action of Λ on $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ defined above. One checks that such an action has to be given by

$$(21) \quad \lambda : (\tilde{w}, a) \mapsto (\lambda^m\tilde{w}, \chi_{\tilde{\xi}}(\lambda^m)a) = (\lambda^m\tilde{w}, \chi_{\tilde{\xi}^m}(\lambda)a), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda, \tilde{w} \in T, a \in \mathbb{A}^1;$$

indeed, this is the only action compatible with the pullback of the translation action of Λ on T via the map $[m]$. The line bundle $[m]^*\mathcal{L}$ is then given by $T \times \mathbb{A}^1$ modulo the action given by (21).

Now suppose that ξ is m -torsion. Then we have $\tilde{\xi}^m \in \Lambda^\vee = \text{Hom}(T, K^\times)$, and the line bundle $[m]^*\mathcal{L}$ is trivial. More precisely, there is an isomorphism of line bundles $J \times \mathbb{A}^1 \xrightarrow{\sim} [m]^*\mathcal{L}$ induced by the isomorphism

$$(22) \quad T \times \mathbb{A}^1 \xrightarrow{\sim} [m]^*\tilde{\mathcal{L}}, \quad (\tilde{w}, a) \mapsto (\tilde{w}, \chi_{\tilde{\xi}^m}(\tilde{w})a)$$

and by carrying over the action in (21) of Λ on $[m]^*\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ via (the inverse of) this isomorphism to the action of Λ on $T \times \mathbb{A}^1$ given by

$$(23) \quad \lambda : (\tilde{w}, a) \mapsto (\lambda^m\tilde{w}, a), \quad \lambda \in \Lambda, \tilde{w} \in T, a \in \mathbb{A}^1.$$

The situation is summarized in the below diagram (the arrows \rightsquigarrow point to quotients by an action).

$$(24) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \Lambda \xrightarrow{(23)} T \times \mathbb{A}^1 & \rightsquigarrow & J \times \mathbb{A}^1 \\ \parallel & \downarrow (22) & \downarrow \wr \\ \Lambda \xrightarrow{(21)} T \times \mathbb{A}^1 & \rightsquigarrow & [m]^* \mathcal{L} \\ \downarrow [m] & \downarrow ([m], \text{id}) & \\ \Lambda \xrightarrow{(20)} T \times \mathbb{A}^1 & \rightsquigarrow & \mathcal{L} \end{array}$$

Now one can readily verify that the line bundle \mathcal{L} can be constructed directly from its pullback $[m]^* \mathcal{L}$ as the quotient of $[m]^* \mathcal{L}$ by the action of $J[m]$ given by $z : (w, a) \mapsto (w + z, \chi_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{z}^m) a)$ for any $\tilde{z} \in T$ reducing to a point $z \in J[m]$ (and any $w \in J$ and $a \in \mathbb{A}^1$): indeed, this gives us the quotient of $T \times \mathbb{A}^1$ by the action of $[m]^{-1}(\Lambda)$ given by $\tilde{z} : (w, a) \mapsto (\tilde{z}^m w, \chi_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{z}^m) a)$ for any $\tilde{z} \in [m]^{-1}(\Lambda) \subset T$, which is isomorphic to \mathcal{L} as constructed using (20) via applying $[m]$. Now, using the trivialization of $[m]^* \mathcal{L}$ given by (22), we may view \mathcal{L} as the quotient of the trivial bundle $J \times \mathbb{A}^1$ by

$$(25) \quad z : (w, a) \mapsto (w + z, \chi_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{z}^m) \chi_{\tilde{z}^{-m}}(\tilde{z}) a), \quad z \in J[m], w \in J, a \in \mathbb{A}^1.$$

Now according to the construction in [14, §20], the character $z \mapsto \chi_{\tilde{z}}(\tilde{z}^m) \chi_{\tilde{z}^{-m}}(\tilde{z})$ equals $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_m(\cdot, \xi)$, thus proving the claimed formula. \square

Corollary 2.5. *The mod- m Weil pairing $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_m : J[m] \times J^\vee[m] \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_m$, restricted to $T^\vee[m] = \bar{\mathbb{T}}_m^\vee \subset J^\vee[m]$ in the second argument, is the same as the pairing in (17).*

The ℓ -adic Weil pairing \mathbf{e}_ℓ , restricted to $T_\ell(T^\vee) = \mathbb{T}_\ell^\vee \subset T_\ell(J^\vee)$ in the second argument, is the same as the pairing in (18).

Proof. Choose elements $z \in J[m]$ and $\xi \in T^\vee[m] = \bar{\mathbb{T}}_m^\vee \subset J^\vee[m]$; choose a lifting $\tilde{z} \in T$; and choose a lifting $\tilde{\xi} \in T^\vee$ which is m -torsion. The first statement now follows immediately from the formula in (19) given by Proposition 2.4 on observing that the character $\chi_{\tilde{\xi}^m}$ is trivial. The second statement clearly follows from the first on considering how the ℓ -adic pairing \mathbf{e}_ℓ is derived via inverse limits from the mod- ℓ^m pairings $\bar{\mathbf{e}}_{\ell^m}$. \square

3. CLUSTERS AND THE BERKOVICH PROJECTIVE LINE

Given the completion \mathbb{C}_K of an algebraic closure of K , we write $v : \mathbb{C}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for an extension of the valuation $v : K^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Below when we speak of a *disc* $D \subset \mathbb{C}_K$, we mean that D is a closed disc with respect to the metric induced by $v : \mathbb{C}_K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$; in other words, $D = \{z \in \mathbb{C}_K \mid v(z - c) \geq r\}$ for some center $c \in \mathbb{C}_K$ and for some real number $r \in \mathbb{R}$ which is the (*logarithmic*) *radius* of D . Given a disc $D \subset \mathbb{C}_K$, we denote its (logarithmic) radius by $d(D)$.

3.1. The Berkovich projective line and related notation. The *Berkovich projective line* $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ over the complete algebraically closed field \mathbb{C}_K is a type of rigid analytification of the projective line $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^1$ and is typically defined in terms of multiplicative seminorms on $\mathbb{C}_K[x]$ as in [2, §1] and [4, §6.1]. Points of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ are identified with multiplicative seminorms which are each classified as Type I, II, III, or IV. For the purposes of this paper, as in [24], we may safely ignore points of Type IV and need only adopt a fairly rudimentary construction which does not directly involve seminorms.

Definition 3.1. *Define the Berkovich projective line, denoted $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$, to be the topological space with points and topology given as follows. The points of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ are identified with*

- (i) \mathbb{C}_K -points of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^1$, which we will call points of Type I; and

(ii) discs $D \subset \mathbb{C}_K$; if $d(D) \in \mathbb{Q}$ (resp. $d(D) \notin \mathbb{Q}$), we call this a point of Type II (resp. a point of Type III).

Let $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ be the subset consisting of the points of Type II or III.

A point of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ which is identified with a point $z \in \mathbb{C}_K \cup \{\infty\}$ (resp. a disc $D \subset \mathbb{C}_K$) is denoted $\eta_z \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ (resp. $\eta_D \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$). Given two points $\eta = \eta_D, \eta' = \eta_{D'} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, we write $\eta \vee \eta' \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ for the point corresponding to the smallest disc containing both D and D' . We define an order relation (denoted by $>$) on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ by decreeing that $\eta > \eta'$ if and only if we have $\eta = \eta_D$ and $\eta' = \eta_{D'}$ for discs $D \supsetneq D'$. Note that for any $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, the point $\eta \vee \eta'$ satisfies $\eta \vee \eta' > \eta, \eta'$ and is minimal (with respect to the “greater than” relation) for this property.

We define a metric on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ given by the distance function

$$\delta : \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}} \times \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

as follows. For points $\eta = \eta_D, \eta' = \eta_{D'} \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ satisfying $\eta > \eta'$, we let

$$(26) \quad \delta(\eta, \eta') = d(D) - d(D'),$$

and for general $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, we let

$$(27) \quad \delta(\eta, \eta') = \delta(\eta, \eta \vee \eta') + \delta(\eta', \eta \vee \eta').$$

We endow the subset $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ with the topology induced by the metric given by δ , and we extend this to a topology on all of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ in such a way that, for any $w \in \mathbb{C}_K$, the sequence $\{\eta_{(w),i}\}_{i=1,2,3,\dots}$ (resp. $\{\eta_{(w),i}\}_{i=-1,-2,-3,\dots}$) converges to η_w (resp. η_∞), where $\eta_{(w),i}$ corresponds to the disc containing w with logarithmic radius i for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ – see [24, Definition 2.1, Remark 2.2] for another (more detailed) formulation.

As is discussed in [24, Remark 2.2], the space $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ is path-connected, and there is a unique non-backtracking path between any pair of points in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$. This allow us to set the following notation. Below we denote the image in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ of the non-backtracking path between two points $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ by $[\eta, \eta'] \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, and we will often refer to this image itself as “the path” from η to η' ; note that with this notation we have $[\eta, \eta'] = [\eta', \eta]$. The above observations imply that, given a point $\eta \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ and a connected subspace $U \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, there is a (unique) point $\xi \in U$ such that every path from η to a point in U contains ξ ; we will often speak of “the closest point in U to η ” in referring to this point ξ . In a similar way, if $U, U' \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ are connected subspaces, we will speak of “the closest point in U to U' ” (and vice versa). Given a point $\eta \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ and subspaces $U, U' \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ (which have nontrivial intersection with $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$), we write $\delta(\eta, U)$ (resp. $\delta(U, U')$) for the distance between η and the closest point in U (resp. between the closest point in U to U' and the closest point in U' to U).

Remark 3.2. One easily sees that the order relation $>$ defined above can be equivalently defined as follows. For points $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, we have $\eta > \eta'$ if η lies in the interior of the path $[\eta', \eta_\infty] \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$. From this one sees that given points $\eta', \eta'' > \eta$, the points $\eta', \eta'' \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ are comparable under the ordering (that is, we have the trichotomy $\eta'' > \eta', \eta'' < \eta',$ or $\eta'' = \eta'$).

Given any subset $A \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$, we write $\Sigma_A \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ for the convex hull of the subspace $\{\eta_z\}_{z \in A} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$, i.e. the smallest connected subspace of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ containing $\{\eta_z\}_{z \in A}$.

We recall the set-up given in §2.1 involving the groups $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0 < \text{PGL}_2(K)$, the subset $\Omega \subset \mathbb{P}_K^1$ of non-limit points under the action of Γ (or Γ_0), the generators s_0, \dots, s_h of Γ_0 , and the fixed points $a_0, b_0, \dots, a_h, b_h \in \Omega$; write $S = \{a_0, b_0, \dots, a_h, b_h\}$. Recall that the image of S modulo the action

of Γ_0 coincides with the set \mathcal{B} of branch points of our superelliptic curve with the points $a_i, b_i \in S$ mapping respectively to $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathcal{B}$ for $0 \leq i \leq h$. For $0 \leq i \leq h$, define $\Lambda_{(i)} = \Sigma_{\{a_i, b_i\}} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ (that is, the subspace $\Lambda_{(i)} \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ is the *axis* connecting z_{a_i} to z_{b_i}), and define $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ to be the tubular neighborhood given by

$$(28) \quad \Lambda_{(i)} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}} \mid \delta(\eta, \Lambda_{(i)}) \leq \frac{v(p)}{p-1}\}.$$

We set analogous notation for the set \mathcal{B} of branch points: for $0 \leq i \leq h$, define $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} = \Sigma_{\{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$, and define $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ to be the tubular neighborhood given by

$$(29) \quad \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} = \{\eta \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}} \mid \delta(\eta, \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}\}$$

(note the difference in radius of this tubular neighborhood from that of $\Lambda_{(i)}$). We see from these definitions that when p is not the residue characteristic of K , we have $\Lambda_{(i)} = \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} = \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$.

Definition 3.3. *A distinguished vertex of the convex hull Σ_S is a point $v \in \Lambda_{(i)}$ for some index $i \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ satisfying that no neighborhood of v in the metric space Σ_S is contained in the axis $\Lambda_{(i)}$.*

A natural vertex of Σ_S is a point $v \in \Sigma_S$ whose open neighborhoods contain a star shape centered at v (with ≥ 3 edges coming out of it).

We define a distinguished vertex and a natural vertex of the convex hull $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ analogously (replacing $\Lambda_{(i)}$ with $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ in the definition).

After applying a suitable automorphism in $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ to our set $S = \{a_i, b_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq h}$ and replacing $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0$ with their conjugates by that automorphism, we may assume $b_0 = \infty$: see [25, Remark 1.2]. A condition on the set S called *optimality* is defined in [24, Definition 3.12], and it is shown as [24, Proposition 3.8 combined with Theorem 3.13] that one can always modify S into an optimal set without changing b_0 or affecting the groups $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0$. In light of all of this, we assume from now on that our set $S = \{a_i, b_i\}_{0 \leq i \leq h}$ is optimal and satisfies $b_0 = \infty$.

Theorem 3.4. *We have $\Lambda_{(i)} \cap \Lambda_{(j)} = \emptyset$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \cap \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)} = \emptyset$ for indices $i \neq j$.*

Proof. The mutual disjointness of the subspaces $\Lambda_{(i)} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ is [24, Proposition 2.13], while the mutual disjointness of the subspaces $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ is [25, Corollary 5.1]. \square

We set some notation that will be used from now on. For any indices $i \neq j$, let $\tilde{v}_{i,j}$ (resp. $\tilde{v}_{j,i}$) be the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ (resp. $\Lambda_{(j)}$) to $\Lambda_{(j)}$ (resp. $\Lambda_{(i)}$), so that $[\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}]$ is the shortest (non-backtracking) path between $\Lambda_{(i)}$ and $\Lambda_{(j)}$, and define the points $\tilde{\tilde{v}}_{i,j}, \tilde{\tilde{v}}_{j,i}$ analogously with respect to $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}, \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$. One sees from unique path-connectedness that the points $\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}$ lie on the shortest path connecting $\Lambda_{(i)}$ to $\Lambda_{(j)}$, so that we have $\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i} \in \Sigma_S$; similarly, we have $\tilde{\tilde{v}}_{i,j}, \tilde{\tilde{v}}_{j,i} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$. For $1 \leq i \leq h$, let $v_i, \hat{v}_i \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ denote the points corresponding respectively to the smallest disc D_i which contains the points a_i, b_i and the (unique) disc $\hat{D}_i \supseteq D_i$ satisfying $d(\hat{D}_i) = d(D_i) - \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$. Analogously, let $\bar{v}_i, \hat{\bar{v}}_i \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ denote the points corresponding respectively to the smallest disc \bar{D}_i which contains the points α_i, β_i and the (unique) disc $\hat{\bar{D}}_i \supseteq \bar{D}_i$ satisfying $d(\hat{\bar{D}}_i) = d(\bar{D}_i) - \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. (Note that we have $\hat{v}_i = v_i$ and $\hat{\bar{v}}_i = \bar{v}_i$ if p is not the residue characteristic of K .) Set $\hat{v}_0 = \hat{\bar{v}}_0 = \eta_\infty$.

Proposition 3.5. *Given an index $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, for any index $j \neq i$, we have the following.*

- (a) *The point v_i (resp. \hat{v}_i) is the unique maximal point in $\Lambda_{(i)} \subset \Sigma_S$ (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$) with respect to the relation $>$, and the analogous statement holds for $\bar{v}_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \subset \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ (resp. $\hat{\bar{v}}_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$).*
- (b) *We have $\hat{v}_i = \tilde{v}_{i,i'}$ and $\hat{\bar{v}}_i = \tilde{\tilde{v}}_{i,i'}$. (In particular, we have $\hat{v}_i \in \Lambda_{(i)} \cap \Sigma_S$ and $\hat{\bar{v}}_i \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \cap \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$.)*
- (c) *We have $\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \Lambda_{(j)}) = \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$ and $\delta(\tilde{\tilde{v}}_{j,i}, \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}) = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$.*

Proof. The fact that v_i is maximal in the axis $\Lambda_{(i)}$ follows directly from the easily verified fact that the points in this axis are those corresponding to discs that either contain exactly one of the points a_i, b_i or minimally contain both points a_i, b_i . It follows from Remark 3.2 that given any $\xi \in \Lambda_{(i)}$ and any $v \notin \Lambda_{(i)}$ with $v \geq \xi$, we have $v \geq v_i$.

Now we clearly have $\hat{v}_i \geq v_i$ with $\delta(\hat{v}_i, v_i) = \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$. In particular, this implies $\hat{v}_i \in \Lambda_{(i)}$. Now take any point $w \in \Lambda_{(i)}$, and let ξ be the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ to w . We have $w \vee \xi \geq \xi$ and thus it follows that $w \vee \xi = \xi \in \Lambda_{(i)}$ or $w \vee \xi \geq v_i$. In the former case, we get $\hat{v}_i \geq v_i \geq \xi = w \vee \xi \geq w$; in the latter case, we get $\delta(w \vee \xi, v_i) \leq \delta(w, v_i) \leq \frac{v(p)}{p-1} = \delta(\hat{v}_i, v_i)$ and therefore $v_i \geq w \vee \xi \geq w$. Either way, we have shown that $\hat{v}_i \geq w$ for any $w \in \Lambda_{(i)}$, proving the statement of part (a) regarding the points v_i, \hat{v}_i . The statements for the points $\tilde{v}_i, \hat{\tilde{v}}_i$ follow from a completely analogous argument.

Since we have $\hat{v}_{i'} > \hat{v}_i$, every point in the path $[\hat{v}_{i'}, \hat{v}_i]$ is $\geq \hat{v}_i$. This means by part (a) that \hat{v}_i is the only point of $[\hat{v}_{i'}, \hat{v}_i]$ lying in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ and therefore is the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ to $\hat{v}_{i'}$ and thus to all of $\Lambda_{(i')}$. Part (b) follows from this and from a completely analogous argument involving $\hat{\tilde{v}}_i$.

Now for any index $j \neq i$, we have $\Lambda_{(i)} \cap \Lambda_{(j)} = \emptyset$ by Theorem 3.4, which implies the inequality $\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, v_{j,i}) > \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$, where $v_{j,i}$ is the closest point in $\Lambda_{(j)}$ to $\tilde{v}_{i,j}$ (and thus to $\Lambda_{(i)}$). Write ξ for the (unique) point in the path $[\tilde{v}_{i,j}, v_{j,i}]$ with $\delta(\xi, v_{j,i}) = \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$. By definition we have $\xi \in \Lambda_{(j)}$, and meanwhile, we have $\xi' \notin \Lambda_{(j)}$ for any point ξ' in the interior of the path $[\xi, \tilde{v}_{i,j}]$. Therefore, we have $\xi = \tilde{v}_{j,i}$ by definition, proving the first equality asserted by part (c); the second equality follows from a completely analogous argument. \square

The author's previous work in [25] leads to the following crucial result relating the sets S and \mathcal{B} .

Theorem 3.6. *There is a homeomorphism $\pi_* : \Sigma_S \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ extending the map given by $\eta_{a_i} \mapsto \eta_{\alpha_i}$; $\eta_{b_i} \mapsto \eta_{\beta_i}$, preserving the ordering relation $>$, mapping $\Lambda_{(i)}$ (resp. $\Lambda_{(i)}$) onto $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$) for each index i , and mapping the points $v_i, \hat{v}_i, \tilde{v}_{i,j}$ to $\bar{v}_i, \hat{\bar{v}}_i, \tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,j}$ respectively for all pairs of indices $i \neq j$. We have $[\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \cap \Lambda_{(l)} = \emptyset$ for all $l \neq i, j$ if and only if any $[\tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,j}, \tilde{\bar{v}}_{j,i}] \cap \bar{\Lambda}_{(l)} = \emptyset$ for all $l \neq i, j$, and for such indices $i \neq j$, the homeomorphism π_* restricts to an isometry $[\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \rightarrow [\tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,j}, \tilde{\bar{v}}_{j,i}]$. In particular, we have*

$$(30) \quad \delta(\Lambda_{(i)}, \Lambda_{(j)}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}) = \delta(\tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,j}, \tilde{\bar{v}}_{j,i}) = \delta(\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}, \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}).$$

Proof. This result is obtained as a corollary of [25, Theorem 1.3] as follows. The homeomorphism $\pi_* : \Sigma_S \rightarrow \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ furnished by that theorem clearly maps $\Lambda_{(i)}$ onto $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ for each i . Fixing an index i and a point $w \in \Sigma_S$, let ξ be the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ to w . Then $\pi_*(v)$ is the closest point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ to $\pi_*(w)$. If $\delta(v, w) \leq \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$, then, in the notation of that theorem, following definitions we get $\mu(v, w) = \delta(v, w)$; applying the formula

$$(31) \quad \delta(\pi_*(v), \pi_*(w)) = \delta(v, w) + (p-1)\mu(v, w)$$

given by the theorem yields $\delta(\pi_*(v), \pi_*(w)) = p\delta(v, w) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ and so we have $\pi_*(w) \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$. If on the other hand we have $\delta(v, w) > \frac{v(p)}{p-1}$, then we have $\mu(v, w) = \frac{v(p)}{p-1} < \delta(v, w)$ and the formula (31) implies that $\delta(\pi_*(v), \pi_*(w)) > \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ and so we have $\pi_*(w) \notin \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$. It follows that the homeomorphism π_* maps each $\Lambda_{(i)}$ onto $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$. (See also [25, Remark 1.4].)

Suppose that $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ are points with $\eta' > \eta$. Then the fact that $\pi_*(\eta') > \pi_*(\eta)$ follows from applying Remark 3.2 and considering that we have $\pi_*(\eta_\infty) = \pi_*(\eta_{b_0}) = \eta_{\beta_0} = \eta_\infty$.

Now, given any indices $i \neq j$, it is clear from the fact that π_* is a homeomorphism of uniquely path-connected topological spaces that it maps $\tilde{v}_{i,j}$ (resp. $\tilde{v}_{j,i}$) to the closest point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$) to $\bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$ (resp. $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$), which by definition is $\tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,j}$ (resp. $\tilde{\bar{v}}_{j,i}$). Similarly, using the characterization of the points v_i, \hat{v}_i given by Proposition 3.5(a), we see that π_* maps them respectively to $\bar{v}_i, \hat{\bar{v}}_i$.

The statement about $[\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \cap \Lambda_{(l)}$ is now immediate. If $i \neq j$ are chosen so that this intersection is empty for all $l \neq i, j$, then, in the notation of [25, Theorem 1.3], it follows from definitions that we have $\mu(v, w) = 0$ for any $v, w \in [\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}]$. Thus, applying the formula (31) given by that theorem to such points v, w shows that π_* restricts to the claimed isometry of paths. \square

Let \mathcal{I} be the directed graph whose vertices are the indices $i \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ and such that any pair of indices $i \neq j$ are connected by an edge directed toward i if the path $[\hat{v}_i, \hat{v}_j] \subset \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1, \text{an}}$ does not pass through the point \hat{v}_l for any $l \neq i, j$ and that we have $\hat{v}_j > \hat{v}_i$. We remark that this graph \mathcal{I} is clearly a tree rooted at the vertex 0: we have $\hat{v}_0 > \hat{v}_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$, so \mathcal{I} is connected with every vertex other than 0 in a “downward” path from 0, and one sees using Remark 3.2 that there cannot be cycles in \mathcal{I} . Given any index $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, let i' be the (unique) index such that the corresponding vertices i, i' of \mathcal{I} are connected by an edge directed towards i .

We now present a corollary to Theorem 3.6 that will be useful later.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $\pi_* : \Sigma_S \rightarrow \Sigma_B$ be the map given by Theorem 3.6. Let $J \subset \{1, \dots, h\}$ be a subset of indices such that we have $\tilde{v}_{i,i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ (which by the first statement of Theorem 3.6 implies $i' = j'$) for any $i, j \in J$, and write*

$$U = \bigcup_{i \in J} [\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]; \quad \bar{U} = \bigcup_{i \in J} [\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}].$$

The map π_* restricts to an isometry $U \rightarrow \bar{U}$ which preserves the ordering relation $>$.

Proof. The statement follows quickly from Theorem 3.6 by noting that the restriction of the homeomorphism π_* to U is given by gluing together the isometries $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}] \rightarrow [\pi_*(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}), \pi_*(\tilde{v}_{i',i})]$ along their (non-empty) intersections and thus is itself an isometry. The order-preserving property is inherited from π_* . (Alternately, Corollary 3.7 can be proved directly from [25, Theorem 1.3].) \square

We now provide a quick dictionary between the language of clusters and that of convex hulls in the Berkovich projective line which will be suitable for our purposes.

Proposition 3.8. *There is a one-to-one correspondence between the non-singleton clusters \mathfrak{s} of \mathcal{B} and the set of distinguished and natural vertices of Σ_B given by sending a cluster \mathfrak{s} to the point $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s}}}$, where $D_{\mathfrak{s}} \subset \mathbb{C}_K$ is the smallest disc containing \mathfrak{s} . We moreover have the following.*

- (a) *For clusters $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{c}$, we have $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}}} = \eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s}}} \vee \eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}$ and $\delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s}}}, \eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}) = d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{c}) - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c})$.*
- (b) *A cluster which is not (resp. is) the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters corresponds to a distinguished vertex (resp. a non-distinguished natural vertex).*
- (c) *An cluster which is not the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters coincides with \mathfrak{s}_i for some index i (and thus, by Proposition 3.5(a), corresponds to the maximal point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$) if and only if that cluster has even cardinality.*
- (d) *An \bar{u} -even cluster corresponds to a non-distinguished natural vertex which does not lie in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ for any index i .*

Proof. The claimed one-to-one correspondence and the claim of part (b) are given by [25, Proposition 3.8(b)]. The first identity given by part (a) comes from an immediate verification, and the claimed distance formula then follows directly from the definition of the distance function δ .

Note that each cluster \mathfrak{s}_i corresponds to the point \bar{v}_i by definition of \bar{v}_i and that \bar{v}_i is the maximal point of $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ by Proposition 3.5(a). Now let \mathfrak{s} be a cluster which is not the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters. By part (b), the corresponding point $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s}}}$ is a distinguished vertex and thus lies in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ for some index i ; which means we have either $\#(\mathfrak{s} \cap \{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}) = 1$ or $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_i$. If the cardinality of \mathfrak{s} is even and if we have $\#(\mathfrak{s} \cap \{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}) = 1$, then we also have $\#(\mathfrak{s} \cap \{\alpha_j, \beta_j\}) = 1$ for some $j \neq i$, implying $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{s}}} \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \cap \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$. Similarly, if the cardinality of \mathfrak{s} is odd and if we have $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_i$, then the fact that $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in \mathfrak{s}$ similarly implies $\#(\mathfrak{s} \cap \{\alpha_j, \beta_j\}) = 1$ for some $j \neq i$, again implying

$\eta_{D_s} \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \cap \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$. Both assumptions thus lead to a contradiction of Theorem 3.4. We conclude that the cluster \mathfrak{s} has even cardinality if and only if we have $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_i$. This proves part (c).

Now let \mathfrak{s} be a cluster which is the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters. For each index i , let ξ_i be the closest point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)} \subset \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ to $\eta_{D_s} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$. By definition, each point $\xi_i \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ is a distinguished vertex and thus by part (b) corresponds to a cluster \mathfrak{c}_i which is not the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters. Suppose that we have $\eta_{D_s} \in \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ for some i . This implies $\delta(\eta_{D_s}, \xi_i) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ for some i . By part (a), this is the same inequality as $d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{c}_i) - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}_i) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ and thus violates Definition 1.2; therefore, the cluster \mathfrak{s} is not $\bar{\text{u}}\text{bereven}$. Now suppose conversely that we have $\eta_{D_s} \notin \bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$ for all i . Then each distinguished vertex ξ , being a point in some $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i)}$, satisfies $\delta(\eta_{D_s}, \xi) > \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. Since by part (a), the distinguished vertices ξ correspond to the clusters \mathfrak{c} which satisfy the property of not being the disjoint union of ≥ 2 even-cardinality clusters, similarly using part (a) we get the inequality (4) for each such cluster \mathfrak{c} , and so Definition 1.2 says that the cluster \mathfrak{s} is $\bar{\text{u}}\text{bereven}$. This proves part (d). \square

Proposition 3.9. *Given an index $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, choose any point $\bar{w} \in [\bar{v}_i, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$; let \bar{w}'' be the non-distinguished natural vertex in the interior of $[\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i} \vee \bar{w}]$ which is closest to \bar{w} if one exists; and let $\bar{w}'' = \tilde{v}_{i,i}$ otherwise. For all indices $j \neq i, i'$ satisfying $\bar{v}_j \vee \bar{w} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}$, we have $\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) > \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w})$.*

Proof. Let $j \neq i, i'$ be an index such that $\bar{v}_j \vee \bar{w} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}$. Then we must have $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}$, because otherwise, we would have $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w} \in [\bar{v}_j, \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \subset \bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$, which contradicts the definition of i' and the hypothesis on \bar{w} . Suppose that we have $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} \notin [\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}]$. This implies the inequalities

$$(32) \quad \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) > \delta(\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}).$$

Suppose instead that we have $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} \in [\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}]$. We then cannot have $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} = \tilde{v}_{j,i} \in \Lambda_{(j)}$, because this would contradict the definition of i' . Thus, the paths $[\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}]$, $[\bar{w}, \tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}]$, $[\eta_{\infty}, \tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}] \subset \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$ each have interior and all intersect at the singleton $\{\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}\}$. This implies by definition that the point $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}$ is a natural vertex. If we have $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} \neq \tilde{v}_{i,i}$, then it follows from the construction of i' that the point $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}$ is not a distinguished vertex, which implies that non-distinguished natural vertices in $[\bar{v}_i, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$ exist and $\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w} \geq \bar{w}''$. Now, noting that we also have $\tilde{v}_{i',i} \geq \bar{w}''$, we are guaranteed the inequalities

$$(33) \quad \delta(\bar{v}_j, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) > \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i} \vee \bar{w}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}).$$

\square

Corollary 3.10. *Given a cluster $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$, a cluster \mathfrak{s}' defined as in the statement of Theorem 1.3 exists, is unique, and can be described as follows. Letting $\bar{w} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the point corresponding via Proposition 3.8 to the cluster \mathfrak{s} , we have $\bar{w} = \bar{v}_i$ or $\bar{w} \in [\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \hat{v}_i]$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Let \bar{w}' be the non-distinguished natural vertex in the interior of $[\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \bar{w}]$ which is closest to \bar{w} if one exists, and let \bar{w}' be the closest point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i')}$ to \bar{w} otherwise. The cluster \mathfrak{s}' is then the one corresponding to \bar{w}' via Proposition 3.8.*

Proof. If $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, then this cluster is not $\bar{\text{u}}\text{bereven}$ by Proposition 3.8(d) and we have $\bar{w} = \bar{v}_i$ and

$$(34) \quad \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}, \bar{w}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \bar{v}_i) = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} = (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}.$$

If on the other hand \mathfrak{s} does not equal any of the clusters \mathfrak{s}_i , then by definition of \mathfrak{C}_0 , this cluster is $\bar{\text{u}}\text{bereven}$; by Proposition 3.8(d), the corresponding point \bar{w} is a non-distinguished natural vertex not lying in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(j)}$ for any index j . It follows from the definition of natural vertex that there is a ray in $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ whose maximal point (with respect to $>$) is \bar{w} ; such a ray approaches a point $\eta_{\alpha_j} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ or $\eta_{\beta_j} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, h\}$ and thus eventually intersects a tubular neighborhood $\bar{\Lambda}_{(l)}$

for at least one index $l \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Among such indices l , let i be the one which minimizes $\delta(\bar{w}, \bar{\Delta}_{(l)})$. Then it is clear not only that $\hat{v}_i = \tilde{v}_{i,i'}$ is the closest point in $\bar{\Delta}_{(i)}$ to \bar{w} but that we have $\tilde{v}_{i',i} > \bar{w} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'}$. In particular, we have

$$(35) \quad \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}, \bar{w}) = \delta(\bar{w}, \bar{w}) = 0 = (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}.$$

Now, given any cluster $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathfrak{C}$ with corresponding point $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}} \in \Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$, we see using Proposition 3.8(a) that the hypothesis $d(\mathfrak{s}) - d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}) > (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ translates to the conditions $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}} \vee \bar{w} > \bar{w}$ and $\delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}, \bar{w}) > (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. Using (34),(35), these conditions imply $\delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}} \vee \bar{w}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) > 0$, in turn implying $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}} \vee \bar{w} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}$.

If the cluster \mathfrak{c} is *übereven*, then by Proposition 3.8(d), the point $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}$ is a non-distinguished natural vertex. It then follows quickly from the definition of the point \bar{w}'' that it is also a non-distinguished natural vertex, and using (34),(35) and Proposition 3.9, we get

$$(36) \quad \delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}, \bar{w}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{c}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} = \delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}),$$

with equality only if $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{s}'$.

If, on the other hand, the cluster \mathfrak{c} is not *übereven*, by definition of \mathfrak{C} and by Proposition 3.8(b), its corresponding vertex $\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}$ lies in $\bar{\Delta}_{(j)}$ for some index $j \neq i$. Then, using (34),(35), Proposition 3.5(c), and Proposition 3.9, we get

$$(37) \quad \delta(\eta_{D_{\mathfrak{c}}}, \bar{w}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{c}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} \geq \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) \geq \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}),$$

with the second inequality being an equality only if $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{s}'$.

By definition, we have $\bar{w}' = \bar{w}''$ if one of them is a non-distinguished natural vertex (which by Proposition 3.8(d) happens exactly when \mathfrak{s}' is *übereven*), and when this is not the case, we have $\bar{w}'' \in [\bar{w}', \tilde{v}_{i,i'}]$ with $\delta(\bar{w}', \bar{w}'') = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} = (1 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}'\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ by Proposition 3.5(c). This, combined with (34),(35), gives us

$$(38) \quad \delta(\bar{w}'', \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \bar{w}) = \delta(\bar{w}', \bar{w}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}.$$

Putting all of this together and using Proposition 3.8(a) to translate distances between points of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{B}}$ into differences of depths of clusters, we get

$$(39) \quad d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{c}) - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{c}) - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{c}\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} \geq d(\mathfrak{s}) + d(\mathfrak{s}') - 2d(\mathfrak{s} \vee \mathfrak{s}') - (2 - u_{\{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'\}}) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1},$$

with equality only if $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{s}'$. The cluster \mathfrak{s}' as we have defined it for this proposition therefore fits exactly the definition of \mathfrak{s}' given in the statement of Theorem 1.3. \square

4. VALUATIONS OF A PERIOD MATRIX OF THE JACOBIAN

The goal of this section is to compute the values of the pairing

$$(40) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^{\varphi} : \bar{\Gamma} \times \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(c_{\gamma}(\gamma')).$$

An explicit description of the values of this pairing for any given $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$ is provided in [8, §4] in terms of the action of Γ on the *Bruhat-Tits tree* associated to $\text{PGL}_2(K)$, defined for instance by Mumford in [13, §1] and by Serre in [16, §II.1]. We denote this tree by \mathcal{T} and define it in the present article as follows.

Denoting the ring of integers of K by \mathcal{O}_K , the vertices of \mathcal{T} are the equivalence classes of rank-2 \mathcal{O}_K -submodules of K^2 , where two such \mathcal{O}_K -modules M, M' are equivalent if there is a scalar $a \in K^{\times}$ such that we have $M' = aM$. Two vertices of \mathcal{T} are connected by an edge if they are represented by \mathcal{O}_K -modules $M \supset M'$ with M/M' isomorphic to the residue field of K . It is known (for instance as [16, Theorem II.1.1.1]) that the graph \mathcal{T} defined this way is a tree. The group of automorphisms $\text{GL}_2(K)$ acts in an obvious way on the space of rank-2 \mathcal{O}_K -submodules of K^2 ,

and this clearly induces an action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on the vertices of \mathcal{T} which is well known and easily verified to be edge-preserving.

A *loxodromic* (or *hyperbolic*) element of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ is one which is represented by a matrix in $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ which is conjugate to a diagonal matrix whose diagonal entries have distinct valuations. Given a loxodromic automorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$, let u_γ denote the quotient of these diagonal elements when they are ordered so that $v(u_\gamma) > 0$. Then it is well known (see for instance [16, §II.1.3]) that there is an infinite non-backtracking path $L_\gamma \subset \mathcal{T}$ which is stabilized by γ and on which γ acts by *translation* with *amplitude* $v(u_\gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ on this axis – that is, the automorphism γ acts on the line L_γ by moving each vertex of L_γ to the vertex $v(u_\gamma)$ edges away in a fixed direction. We call the subgraph $L_\gamma \subset \mathcal{T}$ the *axis* of the loxodromic element γ . As an easy exercise one verifies that the amplitude $v(u_\gamma)$ can also be characterized as the minimum of the distance between v and $\gamma(v)$ over all vertices v of \mathcal{T} . Below we will also freely use the easily verified fact that, fixing an element $\gamma' \in \Gamma$, the action of Γ on the axis $L_{\gamma'}$ is given by $\gamma : L_{\gamma'} \mapsto L_{\gamma\gamma'\gamma^{-1}}$.

It is well known that every nontrivial element of a Schottky group is loxodromic (see for instance [10, §I.1.5]). With respect to our Schottky group Γ used to uniformize our superelliptic curve, let us write $\mathcal{T}_\Gamma := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}} L_\gamma \subset \mathcal{T}$ for the union of the axes of the nontrivial elements of Γ . As the action of Γ on \mathcal{T} permutes the axes L_γ , the subtree $\mathcal{T}_\Gamma \subset \mathcal{T}$ is stabilized by this action. The resulting quotient graph $\mathcal{T}_\Gamma/\Gamma$ is a finite graph by [13, Theorem 1.23]. Let us write $\pi_* : \mathcal{T}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\Gamma/\Gamma$ for the associated quotient map of graphs.

Given any two vertices $v, w \in \mathcal{T}$, write $[v, w] \subset \mathcal{T}$ for the subtree consisting of the (shortest) path from v to w ; the choice of initial vertex v and terminal vertex w gives this path an *orientation*. Given any graph G with vertices v, w, v', w' and any two (possibly backtracking) paths $[v, w], [v', w'] \subset \mathcal{T}_\Gamma/\Gamma$, define $e([v, w], [v', w'])$ to be the total number of edges in $[v, w] \cap [v', w']$, counted with orientation. More precisely, if the pairs v, w and v', w' are each connected by a single edge in the respective paths $[v, w]$ and $[v', w']$, then we set $e([v, w], [v', w'])$ to be 0 if these edges are distinct and 1 (resp. -1) if the edges are the same and $v' = v$ (resp. $v' = w$); then for general paths $[v, w], [v', w']$, we define the pairing e by treating paths as sums of edges (counted with orientation so that opposite orientation corresponds to the additive inverse) and extending \mathbb{Z} -bilinearly.

The following result, which is a rephrasing of [8, Theorem 5], will be our main tool for computing the valuations $v(c_\gamma(\gamma'))$ for elements $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$.

Theorem 4.1. *Choose any vertices v, w of \mathcal{T}_Γ . For any elements $\gamma, \gamma' \in \Gamma$, we have*

$$(41) \quad v(c_\gamma(\gamma')) = e(\pi_*([v, \gamma(v)]), \pi_*([w, \gamma'(w)])).$$

In particular, we have $v(c_\gamma(\gamma)) > 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$.

Remark 4.2. One may observe that the theta functions $\Theta_{a,b}$ are defined differently in [8], so that the factor corresponding to each element $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Gamma$ in the product formula is $\frac{\tilde{\gamma}(z)-a}{\tilde{\gamma}(z)-b}$ rather than $\frac{z-\tilde{\gamma}(a)}{z-\tilde{\gamma}(b)}$. However, it is easy to show from the proof of Lemma 7.3 below (putting $s = \tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$) that each such factor under Drinfeld-Manin’s definition equals $\frac{A-Ca}{A-Cb}$ times the factor corresponding to $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1}$ under our definition, where $\tilde{\gamma}$ is represented by $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$. These terms $\frac{A-Ca}{A-Cb}$ cancel out in the definition of $c_{a,b}$; in particular $c_\gamma = c_{a,\gamma(a)}$ is not affected, and so we may still use Theorem 4.1.

To implement the formula given in the above theorem, we want to move to the Berkovich setting that was developed in §3. In order to make this transition, we define \mathcal{A} to be the graph whose vertices are the points of $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ whose corresponding discs have logarithmic radius in \mathbb{Z} and contain an element of K , and where two vertices $\eta_D, \eta_{D'}$ are connected by an edge if we have $\delta(\eta_D, \eta_{D'}) = 1$.

Remark 4.3. Given any two vertices v, w of \mathcal{A} , one easily confirms that the point $v \vee w \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ is also a vertex of \mathcal{A} ; using this fact, we see that the distance between the vertices v and w (defined as the number of edges in the shortest path between them) equals the distance $\delta(v, w)$ used to define $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ as a metric graph.

Given any automorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ of \mathbb{P}_K^1 , there is a natural way to define its action on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$: see [3, §2.3] or [4, §7.1], for instance. The action of any automorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on a point $\eta_D \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ may be described concretely as $\gamma(\eta_D) = \eta_E$, where $E = \gamma(D)$ if $\infty \notin \gamma(D)$ and E is the smallest closed disc containing $K \setminus \gamma(D)$ if $\infty \in \gamma(D)$ (as can be deduced from [4, Proposition 7.6, Theorem 7.12]; see also [24, Proposition 2.4]). The action of each element of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ is a metric-preserving self-homeomorphism by [3, Proposition 2.30]. It follows that this action induces an edge-preserving action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on the vertices of the graph \mathcal{A} .

Remark 4.4. The trees \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{A} are isomorphic as graphs in a way that carries the action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on \mathcal{T} to its action on \mathcal{A} . This is well known and is more or less shown in [10, §I.2.6]. Here is a summary of a more direct argument. We assign to each vertex v of \mathcal{T} a vertex of \mathcal{A} as follows. The vertex v is represented by a rank-2 \mathcal{O}_K -submodule $M \subset K^2$. Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the minimal valuation among the second coordinate of elements of M , and let $M_0 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in M \mid v(\beta) = r\}$. Then the corresponding vertex of \mathcal{A} is η_D , where $D = \{\frac{\alpha}{\beta} \mid (\alpha, \beta) \in M_0\}$. The inverse of this function assigns a vertex $\eta = \eta_D$ of \mathcal{A} to the equivalence class of the rank-2 \mathcal{O}_K -submodule $M \subset K^2$ generated by $\{(a, 1), (b, 1)\} \subset K^2$, where $a, b \in D$ are elements such that D is the smallest disc containing a, b (so that its logarithmic radius is $v(b - a)$).

One shows that the actions of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{A} are compatible by separately considering the actions of the automorphisms in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ represented by the matrices $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ and $\begin{bmatrix} \delta & \epsilon \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ with $\delta \in K^\times$, $\epsilon \in K$ (these act on \mathbb{P}_K^1 by the reciprocal automorphism and all affine automorphisms respectively), noting that these elements generate the whole group $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$. Showing compatibility for any affine automorphism is immediate. To show this for the reciprocal automorphism, choose a point $\eta = \eta_D \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ and points $a, b \in D$ such that D is the smallest disc containing a, b and we have $v(a) = v(b)$. Then one checks that the reciprocal automorphism sends η_D to η_E , where E is the smallest disc containing a^{-1}, b^{-1} . It is easy to verify that $\eta_D \mapsto \eta_E$ commutes with the action of the automorphism $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ on representative \mathcal{O}_K -modules of the corresponding vertices of \mathcal{T} .

In light of Remark 4.4, from now on we identify the Bruhat-Tits tree \mathcal{T} with the tree \mathcal{A} defined above; in this way, one views the tree \mathcal{T} as the underlying graph of the metric graph given by enhancing the metric space $\Sigma_{\mathbb{P}_K^1} \cap \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\mathrm{an}}$ with vertices given by the points corresponding to discs with integer logarithmic radius and center in K .

Recall that the group Γ_0 containing the Schottky group with index p is generated by the elements $s_i \in \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ which each have order p and fix the points $a_i, b_i \in S$ for $0 \leq i \leq h$, and recall the set of (free) generators $\gamma_{i,0,n}$ of the Schottky group $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0$ defined in (11). It is an elementary exercise to show from this definition of the Schottky group that it is in fact the subgroup of Γ_0 consisting of those words whose total exponent is divisible by p . In particular, we have

$$(42) \quad \gamma_{i,j,n} := s_j^{n-1} s_i s_j^{-n} \in \Gamma, \quad i, j \in \{0, \dots, h\}, n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *The $(p-1)h$ -element set $\{\gamma_{i,i',n}\}_{1 \leq i \leq h, 1 \leq n \leq p-1}$ generates the Schottky group Γ .*

Proof. Consider the tree \mathcal{I} defined in §3. Given any index $i \neq 0$, let $i^{(0)} := i, i^{(1)} := i', i^{(2)} := (i')', \dots, i^{(r)} := 0$ (for some $r \geq 1$) denote the sequence of vertices on the path from i to 0 in \mathcal{I} . For any $i \neq 0$, we may write

$$(43) \quad \gamma_{i,0,n} = [s_{i^{(r-1)}}^{n-1} s_{i^{(r)}}^{1-n}]^{-1} \cdots [s_{i^{(1)}}^{n-1} s_{i^{(2)}}^{1-n}]^{-1} \gamma_{i^{(0)},i^{(1)},n} [s_{i^{(1)}}^n s_{i^{(2)}}^{-n}] \cdots [s_{i^{(r-1)}}^n s_{i^{(r)}}^{-n}].$$

On checking that for any $n \in \{1, \dots, p-1\}$ and any $j \neq 0$, we have $\gamma_{j,j',1} \cdots \gamma_{j,j',n-1} = s_j^{n-1} s_{j'}^{1-n}$ and $\gamma_{j,j',1} \cdots \gamma_{j,j',n} = s_j^n s_{j'}^{-n}$, we see from (43) that the element $\gamma_{i,0,n}$ for each index $i \neq 0$ is a product of elements of the form $\gamma_{j,j',m}$ with $j \neq 0$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$. As the elements $\gamma_{i,0,n}$ generate the group Γ , the proposition is proved. \square

Corollary 4.6. *The $(p-1)h$ -element set $\{\gamma_{i,i',n}\}_{1 \leq i \leq h, 1 \leq n \leq p-1}$ of images of elements of Γ in the abelianization $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a basis of the free \mathbb{Z} -module Γ .*

Proof. We know that the Schottky group Γ is free and generated by $g = (p-1)h$ elements. Therefore, its abelianization $\bar{\Gamma}$ is a free \mathbb{Z} -module generated by $(p-1)h$ elements. By Proposition 4.5, the group Γ is generated by its elements $\gamma_{i,i',n}$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$ and $1 \leq n \leq p-1$, so the abelianization $\bar{\Gamma}$ is generated by the images of these $(p-1)h$ elements. The result follows. \square

Now thanks to the above proposition, the values of the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^{\varphi}$ over the set of generators $\{\gamma_{i,i',n}\}_{1 \leq i \leq h, n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ determine the values of the pairing over all of $\bar{\Gamma}$ (where again we are using the same notation $\gamma_{i,i',n}$ for the element of Γ as well as its image in the abelianization $\bar{\Gamma}$). Our main result in this section gives the values of this pairing over this subset.

Theorem 4.7. *With all of the above notation (in particular v_i, \tilde{v}_i for indices $i \neq 0$), for indices $i, j \neq 0$ and integers $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$(44) \quad v(c_{\gamma_{i,i',m}}(\gamma_{j,j',n})) = \begin{cases} 2\delta(\tilde{v}_i \vee \tilde{v}_j, \Lambda_{(i')}) & \text{if } i' = j', \tilde{v}_i \vee \tilde{v}_j \notin \Lambda_{(i')}, \text{ and } n \equiv m \pmod{p} \\ -\epsilon\delta(\tilde{v}_i \vee \tilde{v}_j, \Lambda_{(i')}) & \text{if } i' = j', \tilde{v}_i \vee \tilde{v}_j \notin \Lambda_{(i')}, \text{ and } n \equiv m \pm 1 \pmod{p} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\epsilon = 2$ if $p = 2$ and $\epsilon = 1$ if $p \geq 3$.

In order to prove this theorem, we first need some lemmas.

Lemma 4.8. *For each index i and each integer $n \notin p\mathbb{Z}$, the subspace of $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ fixed pointwise by the automorphism s_i^n coincides with $\Lambda_{(i)}$. Given any point $\eta \in \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ and letting ξ be the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i)}$ to η , the automorphism s_i^n maps the path $[\eta, \xi]$ isometrically onto $[s_i^n(\eta), \xi]$, and we have $[\eta, \xi] \cap [s_i^n(\eta), \xi] = \{\xi\}$.*

Proof. As we have $p \nmid n$, the automorphism s_i^n has order p . The first statement is given by [24, Proposition 2.8(b)]. The fact that s_i^n maps the path $[\eta, \xi]$ isometrically onto $[s_i^n(\eta), \xi]$ then follows from the metric-preserving property the action of $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ on $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$. Now it follows from that last statement that the intersection $[\eta, \xi] \cap [s_i^n(\eta), \xi]$ is fixed pointwise by s_i^n and thus coincides with $[\eta, \xi] \cap [s_i^n(\eta), \xi] \cap \Lambda_{(i)}$. But this intersection consists of only the point ξ by definition of ξ , thus proving the final statement. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Choose any $\eta \in \Sigma_S$ and any nontrivial element $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$, which we write as a product*

$$(45) \quad \gamma = s_{i_t}^{n_t} s_{i_{t-1}}^{n_{t-1}} \cdots s_{i_1}^{n_1}$$

for some $t \geq 1$, some $n_1, \dots, n_t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus p\mathbb{Z}$, and some indices i_l satisfying $i_l \neq i_{l-1}$ for $2 \leq l \leq t$.

Suppose that we have $\eta \notin \Lambda_{(i_1)}$. Then the closest point in Σ_S to $\gamma(\eta)$ lies in $\Lambda_{(i_t)}$, and we have $\gamma(\eta) \notin \Sigma_S$.

Proof. This is just a special case of [24, Lemma 3.16] (which requires that S be optimal). \square

Lemma 4.10. *For any indices $i \neq j$, write $D_{i,j} = [\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}] \subset \Sigma_S$.*

- (a) *For any integers $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m \not\equiv n \pmod{p}$, the intersection $s_{j'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$ is empty or a singleton.*
- (b) *If $i' \neq j'$, the intersection $D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'}$ is empty or a singleton consisting of one of the endpoints of $D_{i,i'}$ or $D_{j,j'}$.*
- (c) *If $i' = j'$, then the intersection $D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'}$ coincides with the path $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$ if $\tilde{v}_{i',i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ and is empty otherwise.*

Proof. We have $D_{i,i'} \subset \Sigma_S$. Now an application of either Lemma 4.8 or Lemma 4.9 gives us $s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'}) \cap \Sigma_S = \{\tilde{v}_{j',j}\}$ as long as $p \nmid n$. This proves part (a) when $m = 0$. The result follows for general m after applying the automorphism $s_{i'}^m$ to the case where m and n are respectively replaced by 0 and $n - m$.

Note that one endpoint of the path $D_{i,i'}$ is greater than the other under the relation $>$ (that is, we have $\tilde{v}_{i',i} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'}$), and the same is true of the path $D_{j,j'}$. Applying Remark 3.2, it follows that if the paths $D_{i,i'}$ and $D_{j,j'}$ are not disjoint, their intersection is a path $[v, w]$ with $v \geq w$ and where $v \in \{\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{j',j}\}$. Suppose that the path $[v, w]$ is not a singleton, or equivalently, that we have $v > w$. Then as $v, w \in D_{i,i'}$, we get that v is not the lower endpoint $\tilde{v}_{i,i'}$ of $D_{i,i'}$. By construction of the index i' from i , for every index $l \neq i'$, we have $(D_{i,i'} \setminus \{\tilde{v}_{i,i'}\}) \cap \Lambda_{(l)} = \emptyset$, and so we have $v \notin \Lambda_{(l)}$ for any $l \neq i'$. Then we get $v = \tilde{v}_{j',j} \in \Lambda_{(j')}$ only if $j' = i'$. By a similar argument, we get $v = \tilde{v}_{i',i}$ only if $i' = j'$. It follows that we have $i' = j'$ under the assumption that $[v, w]$ is not a singleton, proving part (b).

Conversely, assume that $i' = j'$. From what was observed above about the structure of the intersection $D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'}$, the assertion of part (b) in the case of $\tilde{v}_{i',i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ is now obvious. If $i' = j'$ and $\tilde{v}_{i',i} \neq \tilde{v}_{j',j}$, then, as each point $\tilde{v}_{i',i}, \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ is the closest point in $\Lambda_{(i')}$ to the respective endpoint $\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{j,j'}$, it is clear that we have $D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'} = \emptyset$, completing the proof of part (c). \square

Lemma 4.11. *Choose indices $i, j \neq 0$, and adopt the notation of Lemma 4.10.*

- (a) *Fix an integer $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. A fundamental domain of the axis $L_{\gamma_{i,j,n}}$ associated to the element $\gamma_{i,j,n} \in \Gamma$ with respect to the action of that element is given by the (non-backtracking) path $[s_j^n(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), s_j^{n-1}(\tilde{v}_{i,j})] = [s_j^n(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \cup [\tilde{v}_{j,i}, s_j^{n-1}(\tilde{v}_{i,j})] = s_j^n(D_{i,j}) \cup s_j^{n-1}(D_{i,j})$; this is a path of length $2\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \tilde{v}_{j,i}) = 2\delta(\Lambda_{(i)}, \Lambda_{(j)})$.*
- (b) *No two points in the interior of the subspace $\mathfrak{D} := \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq h, n \in \mathbb{Z}} s_i^n(D_{i,i'}) \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$ are equivalent modulo the action of the group Γ . In particular, for a given $i \neq 0$, no two points in the interior of the fundamental domain given by part (a) lie in the same orbit under Γ .*

Proof. Let us first prove part (a) in the $n = 1$ case. For brevity of notation, (only) in the proof of part (a) we write γ for $\gamma_{i,j,1}$; we then have by definition $\gamma = s_i s_j^{-1}$. Now, applying Lemma 4.8, we have $\gamma(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j})) = s_i(\tilde{v}_{i,j}) = \tilde{v}_{i,j}$ and $[s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{i,j}] = [s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \cup [\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}]$ with $\delta(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{j,i}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j})$. The length of the path $[s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{i,j}]$ then equals $2\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j})$.

Now let L_γ be the axis associated to γ , and let ξ (resp. ξ') be the closest point in L_γ to $s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j})$ (resp. $\tilde{v}_{i,j}$). Now we have $\gamma(\xi) \in L_\gamma$ and

$$(46) \quad \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \xi') \leq \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \gamma(\xi)) = \delta(\gamma(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j})), \gamma(\xi)) = \delta(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \xi).$$

By a symmetric argument, we get the opposite inequality, so we have $\delta(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \xi) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, \xi')$ (and in fact $\xi' = \gamma(\xi)$). It follows that the point $\tilde{v}_{j,i}$, being the midpoint of the path $[s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{i,j}]$, lies in the axis L_γ . Now, applying Lemma 4.8, we have $\gamma(\tilde{v}_{j,i}) = s_i(s_j^{-1}(\tilde{v}_{j,i})) = s_i(\tilde{v}_{j,i})$ and $[\tilde{v}_{j,i}, s_i(\tilde{v}_{j,i})] = [\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}] \cup [\tilde{v}_{i,j}, s_i(\tilde{v}_{j,i})]$ with $\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,j}, s_i(\tilde{v}_{j,i}))$. The length of the path $[\tilde{v}_{j,i}, s_i(\tilde{v}_{j,i})] \subset L_\gamma$ then equals $2\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}) = [s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \gamma(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}))]$. This shows that the amplitude of the loxodromic element γ equals $2\delta(\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j})$ and that we have $s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}) \in L_\gamma$, so that the path

$$(47) \quad [s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \gamma(s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}))] = [s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{i,j}] = [s_j(\tilde{v}_{i,j}), \tilde{v}_{j,i}] \cup [\tilde{v}_{j,i}, \tilde{v}_{i,j}]$$

is a fundamental domain of L_γ under the action of γ . Now the assertions of part (a) for general n follow by considering that $\gamma_{i,j,n} = s_j^{n-1} \gamma s_j^{1-n}$, so the axis of $\gamma_{i,j,n}$ must be $s_j^{n-1}(L_\gamma)$ and a fundamental domain for $\gamma_{i,j,n}$ in this axis for $\gamma_{i,j,n}$ is given by the image under s_j^{n-1} of any fundamental domain for γ in the axis L_γ . Part (a) is proved.

Now choose any point $\eta \in \mathfrak{D} \setminus \{\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq h}$, and choose any element $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$. Suppose that we have $\eta \in s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'})$ and $\gamma(\eta) \in s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$ for some indices i, j and some integers $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we have $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta) \in D_{i,i'} \subset \Sigma_S$ and $[s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m](s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta)) \in D_{j,j'} \subset \Sigma_S$. Now as the point η is not an

endpoint of the path $s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'})$, the point $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta)$ is not an endpoint of the path $D_{i,i'}$. By construction of the index i' from i , the interior of the path $D_{i,i'}$ is disjoint from all subspaces $\Lambda_{(l)} \subset \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{C}_K}^{1,\text{an}}$. In particular, the hypothesis of Lemma 4.9 holds for the point $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta) \in \Sigma_S$ and element $s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m \in \Gamma_0$ provided that $s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m \neq 1$, in which case the lemma tells us that $[s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m](s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta)) \in \Sigma_S$ is a contradiction. Therefore, we must have $s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m = 1$. Then we have $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta) = [s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m](s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta)) \in D_{j,j'}$, so that in fact we have $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta) \in D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'}$ (with $s_{i'}^{-m}(\eta)$ not an endpoint of either $D_{i,i'}$ or $D_{j,j'}$). Now Lemma 4.10(c) implies that this is a contradiction unless $j' = i'$. Then $s_{j'}^{-n} \gamma s_{i'}^m = 1$ implies $\gamma = s_{i'}^{n-m}$. As γ was chosen to be an element of $\Gamma \setminus \{1\}$, and the only power of $s_{i'}$ in Γ is 1, this is a contradiction. We have thus shown that no point of $\mathfrak{D} \setminus \{\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq h}$ lies in the orbit of any other point in \mathfrak{D} .

To complete the proof of part (b) it remains only to show that the points $\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{j,j'} \in \Sigma_S$ for indices $i \neq j$ are not in the same orbit. Suppose there is some $\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$, which we express as a word using the notation in (45), such that $\gamma(\tilde{v}_{i',i}) = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$. If we have $i_1 = i'$, we replace γ with $\gamma s_{i_1}^{-n_1} = \gamma s_{i'}^{-n_1} \in \Gamma_0 \setminus \{1\}$, noting that we still have $\gamma(\tilde{v}_{i',i}) = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$. Then the hypotheses of Lemma 4.9 apply to η and γ , and that lemma tells us that we have $\gamma(\tilde{v}_{i',i}) \notin \Sigma_S$, a contradiction. \square

Now it is reasonably straightforward to prove Theorem 4.7.

Proof (of Theorem 4.7). Given generating elements $\gamma_{i,i',m}, \gamma_{j,j',n} \in \Gamma$, we proceed to compute the value of $e(\pi_*(v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)), \pi_*(w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)))$, which by Theorem 4.1 equals $v(c_{\gamma_{i,i',m}}(\gamma_{j,j',n}))$.

Choose indices $i, j \neq 0$ and integers $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and let $v = s_{i'}^{n-1}(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}) \in \Lambda_{\gamma_{i,i',m}}$ and $w = s_{j'}^{m-1}(\tilde{v}_{j,j'}) \in \Lambda_{\gamma_{j,j',n}}$. Now by Lemma 4.11(a), the paths

$$(48) \quad [v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)] = s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \cup s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'}) \subset L_{\gamma_{i,i',m}}, \quad [w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)] = s_{j'}^m(D_{j,j'}) \cup s_{j'}^{m-1}(D_{j,j'}) \subset L_{\gamma_{j,j',n}}$$

are respectively fundamental domains for the elements $\gamma_{i,i',m}, \gamma_{j,j',n} \in \Gamma$ (using the notation of that lemma). Meanwhile, by Lemma 4.11(b), the points in the interior of their union $[v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)] \cup [w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)]$ lie in pairwise distinct orbits under the action of Γ . It follows that the integer $e(\pi_*([v, \gamma(v)], \pi_*([w, \gamma'(w)])))$ equals the length of the intersection $[v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)] \cap [w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)]$ of these oriented paths, now considered as paths in the graph \mathcal{T}_Γ , signed according to whether they are going in the same or opposite directions along their intersection, which we write as

$$(49) \quad (s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \cup s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'})) \cap (s_{j'}^m(D_{j,j'}) \cup s_{j'}^{m-1}(D_{j,j'})) = \bigcup_{\substack{s \in \{m, m-1\} \\ t \in \{n, n-1\}}} (s_{i'}^s(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^t(D_{j,j'})).$$

By part (a) (resp. (b); resp. (c)) of Lemma 4.10, the length of the intersection $s_{i'}^s(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^t(D_{j,j'})$ equals 0 if $s \not\equiv t \pmod{p}$ (resp. if $i' \neq j'$; resp. if $\tilde{v}_{i',i} \neq \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ – here we have applied parts (b) and (c) by reducing to the $s = 0$ case and then applying the automorphism $s_{i'}^s$). We are therefore done with the proof in all of those cases. Now if $s \equiv t \pmod{p}$ for one of the sets in the union in (49), we have that n is equivalent to m or $m \pm 1$ modulo p ; when this condition on m and n does not hold, the lengths of all the intersections in the union in (49) are 0, and again we are done.

We assume from now on that we have $i' = j'$ and $\tilde{v}_{i',i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$. Suppose we have $m \equiv n \pmod{p}$. Then by Lemma 4.10(c), we have that the length of $D_{i,i'} \cap D_{j,j'}$ equals $\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \tilde{v}_{i,i'}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$. As the automorphisms $s_{i'}^m = s_{j'}^n$ and $s_{i'}^{m-1} = s_{j'}^{n-1}$ are metric-preserving homeomorphisms, this is also the length of $s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$ and $s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^{n-1}(D_{j,j'})$. One checks that the paths $s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}), s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$ (resp. $s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'}), s_{j'}^{n-1}(D_{j,j'})$) (as sub-paths of $[v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)]$ and $[w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)]$ as in (48)) are oriented to end (resp. begin) at the point $\tilde{v}_{i,i} = \tilde{v}_{j,j}$. Thus, the total length we are computing equals $2\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$.

Now suppose instead that we have $n \equiv m + 1 \pmod{p}$. Then the only set in the union in (49) for which $s \equiv t \pmod{p}$ is $s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^{n-1}(D_{j,j'})$, unless $p = 2$, in which case $s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'}) \cap s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$ is also such a set. By essentially the same use of Lemma 4.10(c) as above, the length of this intersection (or of each of these intersections in the $p = 2$ case) equals $\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$. But this time the orientations are different: one checks that the path $s_{i'}^m(D_{i,i'}) \subset [v, \gamma_{i,i',m}(v)]$ ends at $\tilde{v}_{i',i}$, while the path $s_{j'}^{n-1}(D_{j,j'}) \subset [w, \gamma_{j,j',n}(w)]$ begins at that point, and thus the length of their intersection is counted as $-\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$. The symmetric argument yields the same signed intersection length for the paths $s_{i'}^{m-1}(D_{i,i'})$ and $s_{j'}^n(D_{j,j'})$, which appear when $n \equiv m - 1 \pmod{p}$ (including when $n \equiv m + 1 \pmod{p}$ and $p = 2$). Thus in both cases of $n \equiv m \pm 1 \pmod{p}$, the total length we are computing equals $-2\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$ if $p = 2$ and $-\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \Lambda_{(i')})$ otherwise. This completes the proof of all cases of the formula stated in the theorem. \square

5. THE MONODROMY PAIRING AND THE CANONICAL PRINCIPAL POLARIZATION

Fix a prime ℓ . Let $U_\ell \subset \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ be the subset of automorphisms u satisfying that the kernel (resp. image) of $u - 1 \in \text{End}(T_\ell(J))$ contains (resp. is contained in) the submodule $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$ which was defined in §2.3.

For any automorphism $u \in U_\ell \subset \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$, we construct a pairing

$$(50) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{u,\ell} : \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell \times \Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$$

as follows. The homomorphism $u - 1$, being trivial on \mathbb{T}_ℓ , induces a homomorphism

$$(51) \quad \mathbf{u} : T_\ell(J)/\mathbb{T}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_\ell.$$

Meanwhile, in §2.3, we defined a map $\phi_\ell : T_\ell(J) \rightarrow \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ whose kernel coincides with \mathbb{T}_ℓ , which allows us to identify $T_\ell(J)/\mathbb{T}_\ell$ with $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$. On the other side, the fact that T may be identified as the character group $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee, \mathbb{G}_m)$ (see §2.3 and consider that J is the dual of J^\vee) allows us to identify \mathbb{T}_ℓ with

$$(52) \quad \lim_{\leftarrow n} T[\ell^n] = \lim_{\leftarrow n} \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee, \mathbb{G}_m)[\ell^n] = \lim_{\leftarrow n} \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee/[\ell^n]\Lambda^\vee, \mu_{\ell^n}) = \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)).$$

In light of these identifications, we view \mathbf{u} as a homomorphism $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)) \cong \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, \mathbb{Z}_\ell)$, and this defines a pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{u,\ell}$ as in (50).

Remark 5.1. We make the following observations about the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{u,\ell}$ defined above.

- (a) On checking that we have $uu' - 1 = (u - 1) + (u' - 1)$ for $u, u' \in U_\ell$, it is easy to verify that the subset $U_\ell \subset \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ is a subgroup and that the mapping $u \mapsto \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{u,\ell}$ is an injective homomorphism from U_ℓ to the (additive) group of pairings $\Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell \times \Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$.
- (b) Suppose that ℓ is not the residue characteristic of K , and let $\sigma \in I_K$ be a Galois automorphism sending π^{1/ℓ^n} to $\zeta_{\ell^n} \pi^{1/\ell^n}$ for $n \geq 1$. One sees by tracing the construction of the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\ell : M_\ell \times M_\ell^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ defined in [15, equation (3.6)], verifying from the definitions of M_ℓ and M_ℓ^\vee in [15, §3] that they can be identified with $\Lambda^\vee \times \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ and $\Lambda \times \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ respectively, that that pairing is the same as the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma),\ell}$ as we have defined it above. It follows from [15, Theorem 3.3] that there is a unique pairing $\Lambda \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ (known as *Grothendieck's monodromy pairing*) which extends via tensoring with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ to the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma),\ell}$.

We now define the pairing

$$(53) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}} : \Lambda \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

as follows. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and for any $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma} = \Lambda^\vee$, we set $\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle_{\text{mon}} = v(\chi_\lambda(\gamma))$. The following proposition implies that this is in fact the monodromy pairing of Grothendieck mentioned in Remark 5.1(b); it is essentially [6, Theorem 2.1] (and [15, Theorem 5.8]) but generalized to a statement that holds for all primes ℓ .

Below we use the following notation. Write $K_0^\times < K^\times$ for the (multiplicative) group of elements of K of valuation 0. For any prime ℓ and integer $n \geq 0$, write ${}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K^\times} < \bar{K}^\times$ (resp. ${}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K_0^\times} < \bar{K}^\times$) for the subgroup consisting of each element whose ℓ^n th power lies in K^\times (resp. K_0^\times).

Proposition 5.2. *Let ℓ be a prime (not necessarily different from the residue characteristic of K), and let $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$ be a Galois automorphism which fixes pointwise the subgroup ${}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K_0^\times} < \bar{K}^\times$ and sends π^{1/ℓ^n} to $\zeta_{\ell^n} \pi^{1/\ell^n}$ for each $n \geq 0$ and for some (any) uniformizer π and some (any) ℓ^n th root π^{1/ℓ^n} of π .*

- (a) *The automorphism $\rho_\ell(\sigma) \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ lies in U_ℓ .*
- (b) *The extension via tensoring with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ of the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}$ defined above is the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell}$.*

Proof. Choose an element $a \in {}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K^\times}$, so that $a^{\ell^n} \in K^\times$ can be written as $\nu \pi^{v(a^{\ell^n})}$ for some $\nu \in K_0^\times$ and a fixed choice of uniformizer π . Then we may write $a = \tilde{\nu}(\pi^{1/\ell^n})^{v(a^{\ell^n})}$ for some ℓ^n th roots $\tilde{\nu} \in {}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K_0^\times}$ and π^{1/ℓ^n} of ν and π respectively. The Galois automorphism σ fixes $\tilde{\nu}$ and sends π^{1/ℓ^n} to $\zeta_{\ell^n} \pi^{1/\ell^n}$, and it follows that we have

$$(54) \quad \sigma(a) = \zeta_{\ell^n}^{v(a^{\ell^n})} a.$$

We next observe that for each $n \geq 0$, elements of $T[\ell^n]$ are those homomorphisms $\bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \bar{K}^\times$ which take values which are powers of ζ_{ℓ^n} . Viewed as elements of $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} \subset J[\ell^n]$, these points are clearly each fixed by σ as σ fixes each element of ${}^{\ell^n}\sqrt{K^\times}$. It follows that $\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma)$ pointwise fixes the $\mathbb{Z}/\ell^n\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} \subset J[\ell^n]$. Meanwhile, given any element $z \in J[\ell^n]$ lifting to an element $\tilde{z} \in T(\bar{K})$ given by a homomorphism $\chi_{\tilde{z}} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \bar{K}^\times$, we compute using (54) that the lifting $\widetilde{\sigma(z)} \in T(\bar{K})$ of $\sigma(z) \in J[\ell^n]$ is given by the homomorphism

$$(55) \quad \chi_{\widetilde{g(z)}} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \bar{K}^\times, \quad \gamma \mapsto \zeta_{\ell^n}^{v(\chi_{\tilde{z}}^{\ell^n}(\gamma))} \chi_{\tilde{z}}(\gamma).$$

Therefore, the Galois element σ takes z to $z + w$ (recall that we use additive notation for the group $J[\ell^n]$), where w lifts to the homomorphism

$$(56) \quad \chi_{\tilde{w}} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \bar{K}^\times, \quad \gamma \mapsto \zeta_{\ell^n}^{v(\chi_{\tilde{z}}^{\ell^n}(\gamma))}.$$

By our above characterization of the $\mathbb{Z}/\ell^n\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} \subset J[\ell^n]$, we have $w \in \bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}$. Therefore, the endomorphism $\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma) - 1 \in \text{End}(J[\ell^n])$ kills $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}$ and has its image contained in $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}$. On passing to the inverse limits with respect to n , part (a) now follows from the definition of U_ℓ .

To prove part (b), it is enough to show that for each $n \geq 1$, given elements $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma} = \Lambda^\vee$, the values $\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell}$ and $\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle_{\text{mon}}$ are equivalent modulo ℓ^n , which is to say that we have

$$(57) \quad \overline{\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle}_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell^n} = \zeta_{\ell^n}^{v(\chi_\lambda(\gamma))},$$

where $\overline{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell^n}$ denotes the composition of $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell}$ with reduction modulo ℓ^n . It is not hard to see that this reduced pairing factors through a pairing

$$(58) \quad \overline{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}_{\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma), \ell^n} : \Lambda/[\ell^n]\Lambda \times \Lambda^\vee/[\ell^n]\Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell^n}$$

which is constructed in an analogous way to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell}$, with $\rho_\ell(\sigma)$ replaced with $\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma)$, with $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ replaced by $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} \subset \Lambda/[\ell^n]\Lambda$, with the map $\bar{\phi}_{\ell^n}$ from §2.3 allowing us to identify $J[\ell^n]/\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}$ with $\Lambda/[\ell^n]\Lambda$, and with the identification $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} = \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee/[\ell^n]\Lambda^\vee, \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\ell^n})$ analogous to that shown in (52).

Choose any element $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and choose an element $z \in J[\ell^n]$ such that $\bar{\phi}_{\ell^n}(z) \in \Lambda/[\ell^n]\Lambda$ is the reduction of λ modulo ℓ^n th powers of elements of Λ . Our characterization of $\sigma(z)$ given above

shows that $\sigma(z) - z = (\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma) - 1)(z)$ is the point $w \in \bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}$ corresponding to the character described in (56). By construction of the map $\bar{\phi}_{\ell^n}$, this is the character given by $\gamma \mapsto \zeta_{\ell^n}^{\chi_\lambda(\gamma)}$, which (after identifying $\bar{\Gamma}$ with Λ^\vee) factors through $\Lambda^\vee/[\ell^n]\Lambda^\vee$ to yield a character in $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee/[\ell^n]\Lambda^\vee, \mu_{\ell^n})$. Then it is clear by construction of $\overline{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}_{\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma), \ell^n}$ that we have

$$(59) \quad \overline{\langle \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\gamma} \rangle}_{\bar{\rho}_{\ell^n}(\sigma), \ell^n} = \zeta_{\ell^n}^{v(\chi_\lambda(\gamma))},$$

where $\bar{\lambda}$ and $\bar{\gamma}$ are the reductions of λ and γ respectively. The desired formula in (57) follows. \square

We next need an explicit description of the canonical principal polarization of J . To this end, we make the following definition (which possibly originated as [12, Definition 1.2]).

Definition 5.3. *A polarization (in the sense of Mumford) is a homomorphism $\Phi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ satisfying the following two properties:*

- (i) *we have $\chi_{\Phi(\lambda)}(\lambda') = \chi_{\Phi(\lambda')}(\lambda)$ for $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$; and*
- (ii) *we have $v(\chi_{\Phi(\lambda)}(\lambda)) > 0$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda \setminus \{1\}$.*

One checks using property (i) of the above definition that the map $\Phi^* : T = \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee, \mathbb{G}_m) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbb{G}_m) = T^\vee$ induced via pullback by a polarization $\Phi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ restricts to Φ on $\Lambda < T$. This in turn induces a homomorphism on quotients which (by abuse of notation) we also denote by $\Phi : J = T/\Lambda \rightarrow T^\vee/\Lambda^\vee = J^\vee$. It follows easily from property (ii) of the above definition that the map $\Phi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ is injective and therefore has finite cokernel; the map $\Phi : J \rightarrow J^\vee$ is therefore surjective with finite kernel. One sees from [5, Theorem 2.4 and its proof] that the homomorphism $\Phi : J \rightarrow J^\vee$ is in fact a polarization (in the usual sense) on the abelian variety J , which is principal if and only if $\Phi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ is surjective.

Remark 5.4. For each $n \geq 0$, one sees from the above discussion that the canonical principal polarization on J , being an isomorphism, restricts to an isomorphism $\bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bar{\mathbb{T}}_{\ell^n}^\vee$. Therefore, the isomorphism $T_\ell(J) \xrightarrow{\sim} T_\ell(J^\vee)$ induced from the canonical principal polarization by taking inverse limits maps \mathbb{T}_ℓ to \mathbb{T}_ℓ^\vee . It now follows from Corollary 2.5 that for any $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, the submodule $\mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$ is killed by the homomorphism $e_\ell(\cdot, \mathfrak{w}) = \mathfrak{e}_\ell(\cdot, \varphi(\mathfrak{w})) : T_\ell(J) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)$, where the pairing $e_\ell : T_\ell(J) \times T_\ell(J) \rightarrow T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)$ is defined as in §1.1. In particular, the restriction of the pairing e_ℓ to $\mathbb{T}_\ell \times \mathbb{T}_\ell$ is trivial.

Now let $\varphi : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ be the homomorphism given by $c_\lambda \mapsto \text{ev}_\lambda$ (where ev_λ denotes the evaluation-at- λ character as in Remark 2.2). By construction of Λ and by Remark 2.2, this map φ is an isomorphism, and by [8, Theorem 1 and Theorem 4], it is a polarization in the sense of Mumford and thus induces a principal polarization $\varphi : J \xrightarrow{\sim} J^\vee$. The following fact is stated only very implicitly in [15, §7].

Proposition 5.5. *The homomorphism $\varphi : J \xrightarrow{\sim} J^\vee$ is the canonical principal polarization of J .*

Proof. In this proof and elsewhere below, given any pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \Lambda \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and any principal polarization $\Phi : \Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda^\vee$, we denote by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle^\Phi : \Lambda^\vee \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ the pairing given by composing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ with the inverse $\Phi^{-1} : \Lambda^\vee \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda$ applied to the first argument.

Let $\varphi' : \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^\vee$ be the polarization in the sense of Mumford which induces the canonical principal polarization on J . One deduces from [11, Théorème 12.5] (the Picard-Lefschetz formula) a description (given in [15, §3.4]) of the pairing

$$(60) \quad \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^{\varphi'} : \Lambda^\vee \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

via identifying Λ^\vee with the first singular homology group of the dual graph of the special fiber of C . This in turn is equivalent to the definition of the pairing $(\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto e(\pi_*([v, \gamma(v)]), \pi_*([w, \gamma'(w)]))$ from §4, on identifying Λ^\vee with $\bar{\Gamma}$: see [15, Theorem 6.8 and its proof; discussion in §7.3]. By Theorem 4.1, this pairing is the same as the one given by $(\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(c_\gamma(\gamma'))$.

Meanwhile, thanks to Proposition 5.2(b), the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^\varphi$ is given by

$$(61) \quad (\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(\chi_{\varphi^{-1}(\gamma)}(\gamma')) = v(c_\gamma(\gamma')).$$

This means that the pairings $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^\varphi$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\text{mon}}^{\varphi'}$ are equal. The fact that $\varphi = \varphi'$ now follows straightforwardly from the nondegeneracy of this pairing implied by Theorem 4.1. \square

Corollary 5.6. *Let $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$ be an element satisfying the properties given in the hypothesis of Proposition 5.2. The pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell}^\varphi$, viewed via the identification given in Remark 2.2 as a pairing $\bar{\Gamma} \times \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ tensored with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ , is given by*

$$(62) \quad (\gamma, \gamma') \mapsto v(c_\gamma(\gamma')) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. This is just Proposition 5.2(b) combined with Proposition 5.5. \square

As we want to equate the operator $\rho_\ell(\sigma) \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ with a linear operator on $T_\ell(J)$ given by a product of transvections, our final objective in this section is to provide a concrete description of the action on $T_\ell(J)$ of a transvection with respect to an element of \mathbb{T}_ℓ .

Proposition 5.7. *Let ℓ be a prime (not necessarily different from the residue characteristic of K); choose an element $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{T}_\ell = \text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, \mathbb{Z}_\ell)$; and let $t_{\mathfrak{w}} \in \text{Aut}(T_\ell(J))$ be the associated transvection as defined in §1.*

(a) *We have $t_{\mathfrak{w}} \in U_\ell$.*

(b) *Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}}, \ell}^\varphi : \Lambda^\vee \times \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ denote the extension via tensoring with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ of the pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}}}^\varphi$ defined as in the proof of Proposition 5.5. Then this pairing is given by the formula*

$$(63) \quad \langle \mu, \mu' \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}}, \ell}^\varphi = \chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu) \cdot \chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu'), \quad \mu, \mu' \in \Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell.$$

Proof. It follows from Remark 5.4 and the definition of the transvection $t_{\mathfrak{w}}$ that the endomorphism $t_{\mathfrak{w}} - 1 \in \text{End}(T_\ell(J))$ kills \mathbb{T}_ℓ . Meanwhile, it is immediate from the definition of $t_{\mathfrak{w}}$ that the image of $t_{\mathfrak{w}} - 1 \in \text{End}(T_\ell(J))$ lies in \mathbb{T}_ℓ . This proves part (a).

Choose any elements $\mu, \mu' \in \Lambda^\vee$. Now let $\mathfrak{v} \in T_\ell(J)$ be an element satisfying $\phi_\ell(\mathfrak{v}) = \varphi^{-1}(\mu)$, where $\phi_\ell : T_\ell(J) \rightarrow \Lambda \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ is the homomorphism defined in §2.3. By Proposition 2.4, we have

$$(64) \quad e_\ell(\mathfrak{v}, \mathfrak{w}) = \mathfrak{e}_\ell(\mathfrak{v}, \varphi(\mathfrak{w})) = \chi_{\varphi(\mathfrak{w})}(\varphi^{-1}(\mu)) = \chi_{\varphi(\varphi^{-1}(\mu))}(\mathfrak{w}) = \chi_\mu(\mathfrak{w}) = \chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu),$$

where the third-to-last equality comes from the property Definition 5.3(i). Therefore, the endomorphism $t_{\mathfrak{w}} - 1 \in \text{End}(T_\ell(J))$ sends \mathfrak{v} to the element $\chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu)\mathfrak{v} \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, which itself gets identified with the character $\chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu)\chi_{\mathfrak{w}} : \Lambda^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$. Now by construction, we get

$$(65) \quad \langle \mu, \mu' \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}}, \ell}^\varphi = \langle \varphi^{-1}(\mu), \mu' \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}}, \ell} = \chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu)\chi_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mu').$$

\square

6. PROOF OF THE MAIN CLAIM OF THEOREM 1.3

This section uses the results we have built up in previous sections to prove the formula for $\rho_\ell(\sigma)$ claimed by Theorem 1.3. Fixing a prime ℓ and reprising the notation of §2.5, we define the elements $\mathfrak{v}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell \subset T_\ell(J)$ in the following manner. Identifying \mathbb{T}_ℓ with $\text{Hom}(\Lambda^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z}_\ell, T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times))$ as in (16), Λ^\vee with $\bar{\Gamma}$ as in Remark 2.2, and $T_\ell(\bar{K}^\times)$ with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ , for $0 \leq i \leq h$, the character $\mathfrak{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$ is the one determined by the character $\chi_{\mathfrak{v}_i} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ given by

$$(66) \quad \chi_{\mathfrak{v}_i} : \begin{cases} \gamma_{i, i', 0} & \mapsto -1 \\ \gamma_{i, i', 1} & \mapsto 1 \\ \gamma_{j, j', m} & \mapsto 0 \text{ if } j \neq i \text{ or } m \not\equiv 0, 1 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

Note that this character is well defined: Corollary 4.6 implies that the set $\{\gamma_{j, j', m}\}_{1 \leq j \leq h, 0 \leq m \leq p-1}$ generates $\bar{\Gamma}$ with the h (independent) relations given by $\gamma_{j, j', p-1} \cdots \gamma_{j, j', 0} = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq h$, and the map described by (66) is compatible with these relations.

Lemma 6.1. *For $1 \leq i \leq h$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\zeta_p^n \mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, and this character is the one determined by the character $\chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathbf{v}_i} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ given by*

$$(67) \quad \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathbf{v}_i} : \begin{cases} \gamma_{i,i',-n} & \mapsto -1 \\ \gamma_{i,i',1-n} & \mapsto 1 \\ \gamma_{j,j',m} & \mapsto 0 \text{ if } j \neq i \text{ or } m+n \not\equiv 0,1 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. This follows from applying Proposition 2.1 and using the fact that $s_{i'}^n \gamma_{i,i',m} s_{i'}^{-n} = \gamma_{i,i',m+n}$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Given an index $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$, we define the index i' and the points $v_i, \hat{v}_i, \tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}$ as in §4, and we set the following notation. Let $v_i^{(1)}, \dots, v_i^{(r)}$ be the non-distinguished natural vertices in the interior of the path $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$, ordered so that we have

$$(68) \quad \tilde{v}_{i',i} > v_i^{(r)} > \dots > v_i^{(1)} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \geq v_i^{(0)} := v_i$$

for some $r \geq 0$. One sees using Corollary 3.7 that the images $\bar{v}_i^{(s)}$ of the points $v_i^{(s)}$ under π_* for $1 \leq s \leq r$ are likewise non-distinguished natural vertices in the interior of the path $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$, ordered so that we have

$$(69) \quad \tilde{v}_{i',i} > \bar{v}_i^{(r)} > \dots > \bar{v}_i^{(1)} > \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \geq \bar{v}_i^{(0)} := \bar{v}_i.$$

By Proposition 3.8(d), the non-distinguished natural vertices $v_i^{(s)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$ correspond to all of the übereven clusters $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(j)} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$ (strictly) containing \mathfrak{s}_i and contained in $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(r)}$; these satisfy the inclusions

$$(70) \quad \mathfrak{s}_i^{(r)} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathfrak{s}_i^{(1)} \supseteq \mathfrak{s}_i^{(0)} := \mathfrak{s}_i.$$

Lemma 6.2. *With the above set-up and the notation of Theorem 1.3, we have $\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \Lambda_{(i')}) = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq r} m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}}$ and for any $r' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have $\delta(v_i^{(r')}, \Lambda_{(i')}) = \sum_{r' \leq s \leq r} m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}}$.*

Proof. By construction, given $s \in \{0, \dots, r\}$ and for the moment writing \bar{w} for $\bar{v}_i^{(s)}$, the point \bar{w}' defined in Corollary 3.10 is $\bar{v}_i^{(s+1)}$ if $s \neq r$ and is the closest point in $\bar{\Lambda}_{(i')}$ to $\tilde{v}_{i',i}$ if $s = r$. In the latter case, let us denote this point by $\bar{v}_i^{(r+1)}$ and its corresponding cluster by $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(r+1)}$. Subsequently, Corollary 3.10 tells us that we have $(\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)})' = \mathfrak{s}_i^{(s+1)}$ for $0 \leq s \leq r$.

Now by construction of \hat{v}_i , we have $\delta(\bar{v}_i, \hat{v}_i) = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$, which thanks to Proposition 3.5(b) can be rewritten as $\delta(\bar{v}_i, \tilde{v}_{i,i'}) = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. Meanwhile, by Proposition 3.5(c), we have $\delta(\bar{v}_i^{(r+1)}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}) = \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. We then have

$$(71) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \Lambda_{(i')}) &= \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}) = \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}) && \text{by Theorem 3.6} \\ &= \delta(\bar{v}_i^{(0)}, \bar{v}_i^{(r+1)}) - 2 \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} && \text{by observations directly above} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^r (\delta(\bar{v}_i^{(s)}, \bar{v}_i^{(s+1)}) - (2 - u_s) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}) \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^r (d(\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}) + d((\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)})') - 2d(\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)} \vee (\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)})') - (2 - u_s) \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}) && \text{using Proposition 3.8(a)} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^r m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}}, \end{aligned}$$

where u_s is a shorthand for $2 - \#\{s, s+1\} \cap \{0, r\} = u_{\{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}, \mathfrak{s}_i^{(s+1)}\}}$, the number of \bar{u} -even clusters among $\{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}, \mathfrak{s}_i^{(s+1)}\}$. Through a similar computation, for any $r' \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we get

$$(72) \quad \delta(v_i^{(r')}, \Lambda_{(i')}) = \delta(v_i^{(r')}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}) = \delta(\bar{v}_i^{(r')}, \tilde{\bar{v}}_{i',i}) = \delta(\bar{v}_i^{(r')}, \bar{v}_i^{(r+1)}) - \frac{pv(p)}{p-1} = \sum_{s=r'}^r m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}}.$$

□

The main step remaining in the proof is to verify the following.

Lemma 6.3. *With the elements $\mathfrak{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$ defined as above, the notation of $\chi_{\mathfrak{w}} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_\ell$ for any element $\mathfrak{w} \in \mathbb{T}_\ell$, and all of the notation used in the statement of Theorem 1.3, we have the formula*

$$(73) \quad v(c_\gamma(\gamma')) = \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0} \left(\sum_{0 \leq n \leq p-1} m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma) \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma') \right) \text{ for all } \gamma, \gamma' \in \bar{\Gamma}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Corollary 4.6, in order to get the equality of pairings on $\bar{\Gamma}$ given in (73), it suffices to prove that it holds for $\gamma = \gamma_{i,i',\mu}, \gamma' = \gamma_{j,j',\nu}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq h$ and $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}$. Below we freely use Lemma 6.1 in computing the images of these elements of $\bar{\Gamma}$ under the characters $\chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}$.

The only clusters $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$ and values of $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that we have $\chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \neq 0$ are the cluster \mathfrak{s}_i and the \bar{u} -even clusters $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}$ appearing in (70) and the integers n equivalent to $-\mu$ or $-\mu + 1$ modulo p with

$$(74) \quad \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) = -1, \quad \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu+1} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) = 1.$$

The only clusters $\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0$ and integers $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the summand $m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu})$ does not necessarily equal 0 are therefore the clusters which either equal \mathfrak{s}_i (in the case that $i = j$) or equal $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)} = \mathfrak{s}_j^{(t)}$ for some $s, t \geq 1$, and the integers n equivalent modulo p to an integer in $\{-\mu, -\mu + 1\} \cap \{-\nu, -\nu + 1\}$ (thus requiring in particular that $\nu \equiv \mu$ or $\nu \equiv \mu \pm 1 \pmod{p}$). Note that if $i \neq j$, we have $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)} = \mathfrak{s}_j^{(t)}$ (or equivalently $v_i^{(s)} = v_j^{(t)}$) for some $s, t \geq 1$ only if the intersection $v_i^{(s)} \in [\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}] \cap [\tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \tilde{v}_{j',j}]$ is a path with interior and $v_i^{(s)} \geq \tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}$, which by Lemma 4.10(b) implies that $i' = j'$. In particular, the point $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}$ would have to be in the interior of $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}]$, implying that $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'} \notin \bar{\Lambda}_{(i')}$.

The above paragraph implies that if we have $\tilde{v}_{i',i} \neq \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ or if ν is not equivalent modulo p to μ or $\mu \pm 1$, then the right-hand side of the formula in (73) comes out to 0. Now suppose conversely that $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'} < \tilde{v}_{i',i} = \tilde{v}_{j',j}$ (the second equality of which implies that $i' = j'$ by Theorem 3.4) and that we have $\nu \equiv \mu$ or $\nu \equiv \mu \pm 1 \pmod{p}$; we proceed to compute the right-hand side of (73).

We clearly have (using Proposition 3.5(b)) the equalities $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'} = \hat{v}_i \vee \hat{v}_j = v_i \vee v_j$. Applying Corollary 3.7, we get $\tilde{\bar{v}}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{\bar{v}}_{i',i} = \bar{v}_i \vee \bar{v}_j$; by Proposition 3.8(a), this point is the one corresponding to the cluster $\mathfrak{s}_i \vee \mathfrak{s}_j$. If $i = j$, this cluster of course equals \mathfrak{s}_i , whereas if $i \neq j$, then a similar argument to one used in the proof of Proposition 3.9 shows that the point $\bar{v}_i \vee \bar{v}_j$ is a non-distinguished natural vertex. In either case, we therefore have $\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'} = v_i^{(s_0)} = v_j^{(t_0)}$ for some $s_0, t_0 \geq 0$. We then observe that the paths $[\tilde{v}_{i,i'}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$ and $[\tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \tilde{v}_{j',j} = \tilde{v}_{i',i}]$ intersect at the path $[v_i^{(s_0)}, \tilde{v}_{i',i}] = [v_j^{(t_0)}, \tilde{v}_{j',j}]$, by considering that the endpoints of each are comparable under $>$ as in the proof of Lemma 4.10. Therefore, the only clusters \mathfrak{s} such that the summands $m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \chi_{\zeta_p^n \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu})$ for $0 \leq n \leq p-1$ do not necessarily each equal 0 are $\mathfrak{s}_i^{(r_0)} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \mathfrak{s}_i^{(r)}$.

Suppose that $\mu \equiv \nu \pmod{p}$. Then for a given $\mathfrak{s} \in \{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}\}_{r_0 \leq s \leq r}$, from (74) we have

$$(75) \quad \begin{aligned} m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu}) &= m_{\mathfrak{s}}(-1)(-1) = m_{\mathfrak{s}}, \\ m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu+1} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu+1} \mathfrak{w}_s}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu}) &= m_{\mathfrak{s}}(1)(1) = m_{\mathfrak{s}}, \end{aligned}$$

and the analogous summand for n not equivalent to $-\mu$ or $-\mu+1$ modulo p equals 0. The summands in the inner sum of the right-hand side of (73) for this cluster \mathfrak{s} therefore add up to $2m_{\mathfrak{s}}$. Then, by Lemma 6.2, the whole sum in that formula equals

$$(76) \quad 2 \sum_{s=r_0}^r m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}} = 2\delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \bar{\Lambda}_{(i')}).$$

Now suppose that $\nu \equiv \mu + 1 \pmod{p}$. Then for a given $\mathfrak{s} \in \{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}\}_{r_0 \leq s \leq r}$, from (74) we have

$$(77) \quad m_{\mathfrak{s}} \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu} \mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}}(\gamma_{i,i',\mu}) \chi_{\zeta_p^{-\mu} \mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu}) = m_{\mathfrak{s}}(-1)(1) = -m_{\mathfrak{s}},$$

and that the analogous summand for n not equivalent to $-\mu$ modulo p equals 0. The symmetric statement then clearly holds in the case that $\mu \equiv \nu + 1 \pmod{p}$. Noting that these two cases are equivalent when $p = 2$ but mutually exclusive otherwise, we see that the summands in the inner sum of the right-hand side of (73) for this cluster \mathfrak{s} therefore add up to $-m_{\mathfrak{s}}$ (resp. $-2m_{\mathfrak{s}}$) if $p \neq 2$ (resp. $p = 2$) and $\nu \equiv \mu \pm 1 \pmod{p}$. Then, by Lemma 6.2, the whole sum in that formula equals

$$(78) \quad -\epsilon \sum_{s=r_0}^r m_{\mathfrak{s}_i^{(s)}} = -\epsilon \delta(\tilde{v}_{i,i'} \vee \tilde{v}_{j,j'}, \bar{\Lambda}_{(i')}),$$

with $\epsilon = 2$ if $p = 2$ and $\epsilon = 1$ otherwise.

In each of these cases, the value computed matches that given by Theorem 4.7 for $v(c_{\gamma_{i,i',\mu}}(\gamma_{j,j',\nu}))$, and the lemma is proved. \square

Let $\sigma \in I_K$ be as in the statement of Theorem 1.3, Now by applying Corollary 5.6 to the left-hand side and Proposition 5.7(b) to the right-hand side of (73), and by applying the polarization $\varphi: \Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} \Lambda^\vee$ (tensoring with \mathbb{Z}_ℓ) to the first argument for each pairing, Lemma 6.3 tells us that

$$(79) \quad \langle \gamma, \gamma' \rangle_{\rho_\ell(\sigma), \ell} = \sum_{\mathfrak{s} \in \mathfrak{C}_0} \left(\sum_{0 \leq n \leq p-1} m_{\mathfrak{s}} \langle \gamma, \gamma' \rangle_{t_{\mathfrak{w}_{\mathfrak{s}}, \ell}} \right) \text{ for all } \gamma, \gamma' \in \bar{\Gamma}.$$

Now the formula in (6) for $\rho_\ell(\sigma)$ claimed by Theorem 1.3 follows from Remark 5.1(a).

7. THE $(1 - \zeta_p)$ -TORSION SUBGROUP OF THE JACOBIAN

The goal of this section is to explicitly describe certain elements of the p -torsion group $J[p]$ as points in the quotient T/Λ constructed in §2.2, namely those represented by divisors of the form $(\alpha_i, 0) - (\beta_i, 0) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$. Apart from the self-contained and elementary Lemma 7.3, the results of this section are used only to prove the property of the basis of the submodule $T_\ell(J)^{I_K} \subset T_\ell(J)$ asserted in the last statement of Theorem 1.3 (which only pertains to the $\ell = p$ case), and nothing else in this paper depends on them.

As the automorphism ζ_p of the superelliptic curve C fixes each of its ramification points over \mathbb{P}_K^1 , any divisor in $\text{Div}_0(C)$ of the form $(P) - (P')$, where $P, P' \in C(K)$ are ramification points, is also fixed by ζ_p . Therefore, the image of such a divisor in the Jacobian J is killed by the endomorphism $1 - \zeta_p \in \text{End}(J)$. (In fact, the results of [1, §2.3] describe the so-called $(1 - \zeta_p)$ -torsion subgroup $J[1 - \zeta_p]$ as being generated by the images in J of the set of degree-0 divisors of the form $(P) - (\infty)$ for ramification points $P \neq \infty$, where ∞ is the ramification point lying over the branch point $\beta_0 = \infty$; this is shown in a situation where the defining polynomial $f(x)$ appearing in (1) is separable rather than for split degenerate superelliptic curves, but the arguments involved work in the same way when C is determined by an equation of the form in (2).) In particular, since we have $(1 - \zeta_p) \mid p$ in the ring $\mathbb{Z}[\zeta_p] \subset \text{End}(J)$, these elements lie in the p -torsion subgroup $J[p]$ and generate a $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule of $J[p]$ of rank $\frac{2g}{p-1} = 2h$. (The fact that these points are p -torsion can also be checked directly by noting that for any ramification point $P = (\alpha, 0) \in C(K)$, the divisor $p(P) - p(\infty)$ is principal, being the divisor of the function $x - \alpha$.)

The main result of this section, Theorem 7.1 below, describes the images under the analytic Abel-Jacobi map of points of $J[1 - \zeta_p] \subset J[p]$ represented by the divisors $(\alpha_i, 0) - (\beta_i, 0)$ for $0 \leq i \leq h$ (we remark that these divisors do not generate all of $J[1 - \zeta_p]$ but do generate a rank- h $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ -submodule of $J[1 - \zeta_p]$). In order to state this theorem, for a given index $i \in \{0, \dots, h\}$ and a given element $\gamma \in \Gamma_0$, we define $\sigma_i(\gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ to be the reduction modulo p of the sum of exponents of the letter s_i appearing in the element γ expressed as a word on the generators s_j of Γ_0 . It is clear from the fact that the only relations between these generators are given by $s_0^p = \dots = s_h^p = 1$ that the map $\sigma_i : \Gamma_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ thus defined is a well-defined homomorphism. Noting that this homomorphism is trivial on the commutator subgroup of $\Gamma \triangleleft \Gamma_0$, we see that it induces a homomorphism $\bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ which, by slight abuse of notation, we again denote by σ_i . Identifying the group $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ with the subgroup $\boldsymbol{\mu}_p < K^\times$ of p th roots of 1 (by identifying 1 modulo p with the primitive root $\zeta_p \in \boldsymbol{\mu}_p$), we consider σ_i to be an element of $T = \text{Hom}(\bar{\Gamma}, K^\times)$.

Theorem 7.1. *For $0 \leq i \leq h$, we have*

$$(80) \quad \text{AJ}((\alpha_i, 0) - (\beta_i, 0)) = \sigma_i^{n_i},$$

where $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfies $m_i n_i \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ (with m_i the exponent appearing in (2)).

The following corollary gives us the last statement of Theorem 1.3.

Corollary 7.2. *The generators $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_h$ given by Theorem 1.3 in the $\ell = p$ case satisfy that the image of the element $(\zeta_p + 2\zeta_p^2 + \dots + (p-1)\zeta_p^{p-1})\mathbf{v}_i \in \mathbb{T}_p \subset T_p(J)$ modulo p in $J[p]$ is represented by the divisor $\sum_j m_j((\alpha_j, 0) - (\beta_j, 0)) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$, where the sum is taken over all indices j satisfying $d(\mathfrak{s}_i) - d(\mathfrak{s}_i \vee \mathfrak{s}_j) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$ and m_j is the exponent appearing in (2).*

Proof. Fix an index $i \in \{1, \dots, h\}$. Recall the tree \mathcal{I} defined in §3, and define the graph \mathcal{I}_i to be the sub-tree of \mathcal{I} rooted at the vertex i (that is, the sub-tree consisting of all vertices “downstream” from i , meaning that there is a directed path from i ending at each such vertex). Then by definition, using the notation set in §3, we have $j \in \mathcal{I}_i$ if and only if $\hat{v}_i > \hat{v}_j$. This condition gives us $\hat{v}_i > v_i, v_j$ and therefore $\hat{v}_i \geq v_i \vee v_j \geq v_i$, which via Proposition 3.8(a) and Proposition 3.5(a)(b)(c) can be translated to the condition that $\delta(v_i \vee v_j, v_i) \leq \frac{pv(p)}{p-1}$. Thus, the divisor in $\text{Div}_0(C)$ specified in the statement can be written as $m_i \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} ((\alpha_j, 0) - (\beta_j, 0))$. By Theorem 7.1, we have

$$(81) \quad \text{AJ}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} m_j((\alpha_j, 0) - (\beta_j, 0))\right) = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \sigma_j^{m_j n_j} = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \sigma_j.$$

Let us recall the set $\{\gamma_{l, \nu', \nu}\}_{1 \leq l \leq h, 1 \leq \nu' \leq p-1}$ defined in §4 and established as a basis of $\bar{\Gamma}$ by Corollary 4.6. We have

$$(82) \quad \sigma_j : \begin{cases} \gamma_{j, j', \nu} & \mapsto \zeta_p \\ \gamma_{l, \nu', \nu} & \mapsto \zeta_p^{-1} \text{ if } j = l' \\ \gamma_{l, \nu', \nu} & \mapsto 1 \text{ if } j \neq l, l'. \end{cases}$$

Then for $l \notin \mathcal{I}_i$ (resp. $l \in \mathcal{I}_i \setminus \{i\}$) so that $l' \in \mathcal{I}_i$; resp. $l = i \in \mathcal{I}_i$ so that $l' \notin \mathcal{I}_i$, the product $\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \sigma_j(\gamma_{l, \nu', \nu})$ comes out to 1 (resp. $\zeta_p \zeta_p^{-1} = 1$; resp. ζ_p). Therefore, $\prod_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} \sigma_j : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\mu}_p$ is the character mapping $\gamma_{i, i', \nu}$ to ζ_p for all $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ and mapping $\gamma_{l, \nu', \nu}$ to 1 for all $l \neq i$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Meanwhile, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ viewing $\zeta_p^n \mathbf{v}_i$ as determined by the character $\chi_{\mathbf{v}_i} : \bar{\Gamma} \rightarrow T_p(\bar{K}^\times)$ given by the formula provided in (67) by Lemma 6.1, its reduction modulo p is the character

$$(83) \quad \bar{\chi}_{\zeta_p^n \mathbf{v}_i} : \begin{cases} \gamma_{i, i', -n} & \mapsto \zeta_p^{-1} \\ \gamma_{i, i', 1-n} & \mapsto \zeta_p \\ \gamma_{l, \nu', m} & \mapsto 1 \text{ if } l \neq i \text{ or } m + n \not\equiv 0, 1 \pmod{p}. \end{cases}$$

Now the sum $(\sum_{n=1}^{p-1} n\zeta_p^n)\mathbf{v}_i$ is determined by a character whose reduction is $\prod_{n=1}^{p-1} \bar{\chi}_{\zeta_p^n}^n$, which sends $\gamma_{i,i',\nu}$ to $(\zeta_p^{-1})^{-\nu}(\zeta_p)^{1-\nu} = \zeta_p$ and which sends $\gamma_{l,l',\nu}$ to 1 for $l \neq i$. This matches the character computed above which is represented by the divisor $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_i} m_j((\alpha_j, 0) - (\beta_j, 0)) \in \text{Div}_0(C)$. \square

In order to prove Theorem 7.1, we need a couple of lemmas. The first of these is essentially [22, Lemma 1.1], but since that source is difficult to access and there is a repeated typo in one of the formulas, we rephrase (a slight generalization of) the result and its proof below.

Lemma 7.3. *Given $a, b \in \Omega$ and an automorphism $s \in \text{PGL}_2(K)$ which normalizes the subgroup $\Gamma < \text{PGL}_2(K)$ and which is represented by the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}$, we have*

$$(84) \quad \Theta_{a,b}(s(z)) \equiv c\Theta_{s^{-1}a, s^{-1}b}(z),$$

where the constant $c \in K^\times$ is given by

$$(85) \quad c = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{A - C\gamma(a)}{A - C\gamma(b)} = \Theta_{a,b}(AC^{-1}) = \Theta_{a,b}(s(\infty)).$$

Remark 7.4. Having set $\infty = b_0 \in S \subset \Omega$, we have $s(\infty) \in \Omega$, and so the product in the above formula for c converges.

Proof (of Lemma 7.3). With the symbol \cdot indicating the action of (the image in $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ of) a matrix on an element of $K \cup \{\infty\}$, we compute

$$(86) \quad \begin{aligned} \Theta_{a,b}(s(z)) &= \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{s(z) - \gamma(a)}{s(z) - \gamma(b)} = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left(\begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\gamma(a) \\ 1 & -\gamma(b) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \cdot z \right) \\ &= \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left(\begin{bmatrix} A - C\gamma(a) & 0 \\ 0 & A - C\gamma(b) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -s^{-1}\gamma(a) \\ 1 & -s^{-1}\gamma(b) \end{bmatrix} \cdot z \right) \\ &= \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left(\frac{A - C\gamma(a)}{A - C\gamma(b)} \right) \left(\frac{z - s^{-1}\gamma s(s^{-1}(a))}{z - s^{-1}\gamma s(s^{-1}(b))} \right) = c \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{z - \gamma(s^{-1}(a))}{z - \gamma(s^{-1}(b))}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 7.5. *Choose an element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ and an index $i \in \{0, \dots, h\}$. Let $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ be as in Theorem 7.1. We have*

$$(87) \quad \prod_{d=0}^{p-1} \frac{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) s_i^d \gamma s_i^{-d}(a_i)}{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) s_i^d \gamma s_i^{-d}(b_i)} = 1.$$

Proof. Throughout this proof, in order to simplify notation, we drop the index i from the symbols a_i, b_i, s_i, n_i .

We first compute a matrix in $\text{GL}_2(K)$ representing s^d for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. As discussed in §2.1, there is a matrix representing s which is similar to the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \zeta_p^b & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$. The image of such a matrix in $\text{PGL}_2(K)$ fixes ∞ and 0, and, as in the set-up of [20, Proposition 3.2], the automorphism s is obtained by conjugating this by a rational linear transformation which sends 0 and ∞ respectively to a and b ; such a transformation is given by $z \mapsto \frac{bz+a}{z+1}$. Therefore, we may compute a matrix representing s^d to be

$$(88) \quad \begin{bmatrix} b & a \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_p^n & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^d \begin{bmatrix} b & a \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \zeta_p^{dn} b - a & (1 - \zeta_p^{dn}) ab \\ (\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) & b - \zeta_p^{dn} a \end{bmatrix}.$$

Now for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, let us write

$$\xi_N = \frac{(\zeta_p^N - 1)\gamma(a) + (b - \zeta_p^N a)}{(\zeta_p^N - 1)\gamma(b) + (b - \zeta_p^N a)} \in K.$$

Noting that as the elements $a, b \in \Omega$ are each fixed by s , we have $\gamma s^{-d}(a) = \gamma(a)$ and $\gamma s^{-d}(b) = \gamma(b)$, we now compute the term in the product in (87) corresponding to a fixed d as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(\zeta_p^n b - a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) s^d(\gamma(a))}{(\zeta_p^n b - a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) s^d(\gamma(b))} = \frac{(\zeta_p^n b - a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) \left(\frac{(\zeta_p^{dn} b - a) \gamma(a) + (1 - \zeta_p^{dn}) ab}{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(a) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)} \right)}{(\zeta_p^n b - a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) \left(\frac{(\zeta_p^{dn} b - a) \gamma(b) + (1 - \zeta_p^{dn}) ab}{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(b) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)} \right)} \\
(89) \quad &= \left(\frac{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(b) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)}{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(a) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)} \right) \frac{(\zeta_p^n b - a) (\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(a) + (\zeta_p^n b - a) (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) (\zeta_p^{dn} b - a) \gamma(a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) (1 - \zeta_p^{dn}) ab}{(\zeta_p^n b - a) (\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(b) + (\zeta_p^n b - a) (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) (\zeta_p^{dn} b - a) \gamma(b) + (1 - \zeta_p^n) (1 - \zeta_p^{dn}) ab} \\
&= \left(\frac{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(b) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)}{(\zeta_p^{dn} - 1) \gamma(a) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn} a)} \right) \left(\frac{\zeta_p^n (b - a) ((\zeta_p^{dn-n} - 1) \gamma(a) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn-n} a))}{\zeta_p^n (b - a) ((\zeta_p^{dn-n} - 1) \gamma(b) + (b - \zeta_p^{dn-n} a))} \right) \\
&= \xi_{dn}^{-1} \xi_{dn-n}.
\end{aligned}$$

The product in (87) can thus be written as $\prod_{d=0}^{p-1} \xi_{dn}^{-1} \xi_{(d-1)n}$, in which all terms clearly cancel (as ξ_N only depends on N modulo p) so that the product becomes 1. \square

Lemma 7.6. *Putting $a = a_i$, $b = b_i$, and $s = s_i$ into the statement of Lemma 7.3 and letting n_i be as in Theorem 7.1, the constant $c \in K^\times$ guaranteed by Lemma 7.3 equals $\zeta_p^{n_i}$.*

Proof. Using the formula for c provided by Lemma 7.3 and the fact that s_i is represented by the matrix given in (88), we have

$$(90) \quad c = \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \frac{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) \gamma(a_i)}{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) \gamma(b_i)}.$$

Now it follows from the group structure of Γ discussed in §2.1 that each orbit of Γ under the action of conjugation by s_i has cardinality p except for the orbit consisting of the identity. The terms of the product in (90) consist of the term corresponding to $\gamma = 1$ and the terms corresponding to each of the p elements of Γ in each of the orbits $\{s_i^d \gamma_0 s_i^{-d}\}_{0 \leq d \leq p-1}$ represented by an element $\gamma_0 \in \Gamma \setminus \{1\}$. For each such orbit $\{s_i^d \gamma_0 s_i^{-d}\}_{0 \leq d \leq p-1}$, the product of the terms corresponding to elements in that orbit comes out to 1 by Lemma 7.5. The formula for c in (90) therefore simplifies to just the term in the product corresponding to $\gamma = 1$; thus, we may compute

$$(91) \quad c = \frac{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) a_i}{(\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - a_i) + (1 - \zeta_p^{n_i}) b_i} = \frac{\zeta_p^{n_i} b_i - \zeta_p^{n_i} a_i}{b_i - a_i} = \zeta_p^{n_i}.$$

\square

We are now ready to prove Theorem 7.1; most of the ideas of our argument are a variation on the proof of [22, Proposition 1.4].

Proof (of Theorem 7.1). Fix an index i . Recalling the elements $\gamma_{j,i,n} = \gamma_i^{n-1} \gamma_j \gamma_i^{-n} \in \Gamma$ in §4 for $j \neq i$ and $1 \leq n \leq p-1$ (note the reversed labeling of the indices), one easily sees that these $(p-1)h$ elements generate the group Γ (and thus that their images in $\bar{\Gamma}$, also denoted $\gamma_{j,i,d}$, generate $\bar{\Gamma}$).

Recalling from §2.1 that the images of the points $a_i, b_i \in \Omega$ modulo the action of Γ_0 are respectively $\alpha_i, \beta_i \in K \cup \{\infty\}$, the image of the divisor $(\alpha_i, 0) - (\beta_i, 0)$ under the Abel-Jacobi map is $c_{a_i, b_i} \in T$. Our task is therefore to show that, for $1 \leq n \leq p-1$ and $j \neq i$, we have

$$(92) \quad c_{a_i, b_i}(\gamma_{j,i,n}) = \zeta_p^{-n_i} = \sigma_i^{n_i}(\gamma_{j,i,n}).$$

Fix an integer $n \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$ and an index $j \neq i$. To compute $c_{a_i, b_i}(\gamma_{j,i,n})$ in terms of theta functions, we may put $z = s_i^n(a_j) \in \Omega$ and exploit the fact that a_j is fixed by s_j . Using Lemmas 7.3 and 7.6, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
(93) \quad c_{a_i, b_i}(\gamma_{j,i,n}) &= \Theta_{a_i, b_i}(\gamma_{j,i,n}(z)) \Theta_{a_i, b_i}(z)^{-1} = [\Theta_{a_i, b_i}(s_i^{n-1}(a_j))] [\Theta_{a_i, b_i}(s_i^n(a_j))]^{-1} \\
&= [\zeta_p^{(n-1)n_i} \Theta_{a_i, b_i}(a_j)] [\zeta_p^{n_i} \Theta_{a_i, b_i}(a_j)]^{-1} = \zeta_p^{-n_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

REFERENCES

- [1] Vishal Arul. *Explicit Division and Torsion Points on Superelliptic Curves and Jacobians*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2020.
- [2] Matthew Baker. An introduction to Berkovich analytic spaces and non-archimedean potential theory on curves. *p-adic Geometry (Lectures from the 2007 Arizona Winter School)*, *AMS University Lecture Series*, 45, 2008.
- [3] Matthew Baker and Robert S Rumely. *Potential theory and dynamics on the Berkovich projective line*. Number 159. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [4] Robert L. Benedetto. *Dynamics in one non-archimedean variable*, volume 198. American Mathematical Soc., 2019.
- [5] Siegfried Bosch and Werner Lütkebohmert. Degenerating abelian varieties. *Topology*, 30(4):653–698, 1991.
- [6] Robert F. Coleman. The monodromy pairing. *Asian Journal of Mathematics*, 4(2):315–330, 2000.
- [7] Tim Dokchitser, Vladimir Dokchitser, Céline Maistret, and Adam Morgan. Arithmetic of hyperelliptic curves over local fields. *Mathematische Annalen*, pages 1–110, 2022.
- [8] V. Drinfeld and Yu. Manin. Periods of p -adic schottky groups. 1973.
- [9] Jędrzej Garnek. The “exponential” torsion of superelliptic Jacobians. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02377*, 2024.
- [10] Lothar Gerritzen and Marius van der Put. *Schottky groups and Mumford curves*. Springer, 2006.
- [11] Alexandre Grothendieck and Michel Raynaud. Modeles de Néron et monodromie. In *Groupes de Monodromie en Géométrie Algébrique*, pages 313–523. Springer, 1972.
- [12] David Mumford. An analytic construction of degenerating abelian varieties over complete rings. *Compositio Mathematica*, 24(3):239–272, 1972.
- [13] David Mumford. An analytic construction of degenerating curves over complete local rings. *Compositio Mathematica*, 24(2):129–174, 1972.
- [14] David Mumford. *Abelian varieties*, volume 108. Oxford Univ Press, 1974.
- [15] Mihran Papikian. Non-archimedean uniformization and monodromy pairing. *Tropical and non-Archimedean geometry*, 605:123–160, 2013.
- [16] Jean-Pierre Serre. Trees. Translated from the French original by John Stillwell. Corrected 2nd printing of the 1980 English translation. *Springer Monographs in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003.
- [17] Joseph H. Silverman. *Advanced topics in the arithmetic of elliptic curves*. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 151, 1994.
- [18] Joseph H. Silverman. *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*. *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, 106, 2009.
- [19] John Tate. A review of non-archimedean elliptic functions. *Elliptic Curves, Modular Forms and Fermat’s Last Theorem*, pages 310–314, 1995.
- [20] Guido van Steen. Galois coverings of the non-archimedean projective line. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 180:217–224, 1982.
- [21] Guido van Steen. Non-archimedean Schottky groups and hyperelliptic curves. In *Indagationes Mathematicae (Proceedings)*, volume 86, pages 97–109. North-Holland, 1983.
- [22] Guido van Steen. Note on coverings of the projective line by Mumford curves. *Bulletin of the Belgian Mathematical Society*, 38, 1983.
- [23] Jeffrey Yelton. Boundedness results for 2-adic Galois images associated to hyperelliptic Jacobians. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 294(8):1629–1643, 2021.
- [24] Jeffrey Yelton. Branch points of split degenerate superelliptic curves I: construction of Schottky groups. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17823v3*, 2024.
- [25] Jeffrey Yelton. Branch points of split degenerate superelliptic curves II: on a conjecture of Gerritzen and van der Put. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.11303*, 2024.