

DIVISION BY 2 ON ODD DEGREE HYPERELLIPTIC CURVES AND THEIR JACOBIANS

YURI G. ZARHIN

In memory of V.A. Iskovskikh

ABSTRACT. Let K be an algebraically closed field of characteristic different from 2, g a positive integer, $f(x)$ a degree $(2g+1)$ polynomial with coefficients in K and without multiple roots, $\mathcal{C} : y^2 = f(x)$ the corresponding genus g hyperelliptic curve over K , and J the jacobian of \mathcal{C} . We identify \mathcal{C} with the image of its canonical embedding into J (the infinite point of \mathcal{C} goes to the identity element of J). It is well known that for each $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$ there are exactly 2^{2g} elements $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ such that $2\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$. M. Stoll constructed an *algorithm* that provides Mumford representations of all such \mathfrak{a} , in terms of the Mumford representation of \mathfrak{b} . The aim of this paper is to give *explicit formulas* for Mumford representations of all such \mathfrak{a} , when $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$ is given by $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$ in terms of coordinates a, b . We also prove that if $g > 1$ then $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does *not* contain torsion points with order between 3 and $2g$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let K be an algebraically closed field of characteristic different from 2.

Let $g \geq 1$ be an integer. Let \mathcal{C} be the smooth projective model of the smooth affine plane K -curve

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

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}$ are *distinct* elements of K . It is well known that \mathcal{C} is a genus g hyperelliptic curve over K with precisely one *infinite* point, which we denote by ∞ . In other words,

$$\mathcal{C}(K) = \{(a, b) \in K^2 \mid b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (a - \alpha_i)\} \sqcup \{\infty\}.$$

Clearly, x and y are nonconstant rational functions on \mathcal{C} , whose only pole is ∞ . More precisely, the polar divisor of x is $2(\infty)$ and the polar divisor of y is $(2g+1)(\infty)$. The zero divisor of y is $\sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} (\mathfrak{W}_i)$ where

$$\mathfrak{W}_i = (\alpha_i, 0) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g+1.$$

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

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

Partially supported by Simons Foundation Collaboration grant # 585711.

I've started to write this paper during my stay in May-June 2016 at the Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik (Bonn, Germany) and finished it during my next visit to the Institute in May-July 2018. The MPIM hospitality and support are gratefully acknowledged.

We write ι for the hyperelliptic involution

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

The set of all fixed points of ι consists of ∞ and all \mathfrak{W}_i . It is well known that for each $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ the divisor $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$ is principal. More precisely, if $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ then $(P) + \iota(P) - 2(\infty)$ is the divisor of the rational function $x - a$ on \mathcal{C} . If D is a divisor on \mathcal{C} then we write $\text{supp}(D)$ for its *support*, which is a finite subset of $\mathcal{C}(K)$.

We write J for the jacobian of \mathcal{C} , which is a g -dimensional abelian variety over K . If D is a degree zero divisor on \mathcal{C} then we write $\text{cl}(D)$ for its linear equivalence class, which is viewed as an element of $J(K)$. Elements of $J(K)$ may be described in terms of so called **Mumford representations** (see [5, Sect. 3.12], [13, Sect. 13.2, pp. 411–415, especially, Prop. 13.4, Th. 13.5 and Th. 13.7] and Section 2 below.)

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

Since K is algebraically closed, the commutative group $J(K)$ is divisible. It is well known that for each $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$ there are exactly 2^{2g} elements $\mathfrak{a} = \frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$ such that $2\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$. M. Stoll [12, Sect. 5] constructed an *algorithm* that provides Mumford representations of all such \mathfrak{a} in terms of the Mumford representation of \mathfrak{b} . The aim of this paper is to give *explicit formulas* (Theorem 3.2) for Mumford representations of all $\frac{1}{2}\mathfrak{b}$ when $\mathfrak{b} \in J(K)$ is given by

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

on \mathcal{C} , in terms of its coordinates $a, b \in K$. (Here $b^2 = f(a)$.) The case

$$\mathfrak{b} = \infty = 0 \in J(K)$$

boils down to a well known description of points of order 2 on the jacobian [5, Ch. 3a, Sect. 2]; one may easily write down explicitly Mumford representations for the order 2 points, see Examples 2.1.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall basic facts about Mumford representations and obtain auxiliary results about divisors on hyperelliptic curves. In particular, we prove (Theorem 2.5) that if $g > 1$ then the only point of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ that is divisible by two in the *theta divisor* Θ of J (rather than in $J(K)$) is ∞ . We also prove that $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does *not* contain points of order n if $3 \leq n \leq 2g$. In addition, we discuss torsion points on certain natural subvarieties of Θ when J has “large monodromy”. In Section 3 we describe explicitly for a given $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ the Mumford representation of 2^{2g} divisor classes $\text{cl}(D - g(\infty))$ such that D is an effective degree g reduced divisor on \mathcal{C} and

$$2\text{cl}(D - g(\infty)) = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K).$$

The description is given in terms of collections of square roots $r_i = \sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 2g + 1$), whose product $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i$ is $-b$. (There are exactly 2^{2g} choices of such collections of square roots.)

This paper is a follow up of [1] where the (more elementary) case of elliptic curves is discussed. (See also [9, 14].)

Acknowledgements. I am grateful to Bjorn Poonen, Michael Stoll and Tatiana Bandman for useful comments. My special thanks go to the referee for thoughtful reading of the manuscript.

2. DIVISORS ON HYPERELLIPTIC CURVES

As usual, a *monic* polynomial is a polynomial with leading coefficient 1.

Recall [13, Sect. 13.2, p. 411] that if D is an effective divisor of (nonnegative) degree m , whose support does *not* contain ∞ , then the degree zero divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is called *semi-reduced* if it enjoys the following properties.

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

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

Notice that a point of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ that is *not* one of \mathfrak{W}_i 's may appear in in a (semi)-reduced divisor with multiplicity > 1 .

It is known ([5, Ch. 3a], [13, Sect. 13.2, Prop. 3.6 on p. 413]) that for each $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ there exist *exactly one* nonnegative m and (effective) degree m divisor D such that the degree zero divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is *reduced* and $\text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}$. (E.g., the zero divisor with $m = 0$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{a} = 0$.) If

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

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

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

The *Mumford representation* ([5, Sect. 3.12], [13, Sect. 13.2, pp. 411–415, especially, Prop. 13.4, Th. 13.5 and Th. 13.7] of $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ is the pair $(U(x), V(x))$ of polynomials $U(x), V(x) \in K[x]$ that enjoys the following properties.

•

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

is a degree m monic polynomial;

- $V(x)$ has degree $< m = \deg(U)$;
- the polynomial $V(x)^2 - f(x)$ is divisible by $U(x)$;
- each Q_j is a zero of $y - V(x)$, i.e.,

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

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

Examples 2.1. (i) The case $\mathfrak{a} = 0$ corresponds to $m = 0, D = 0$ and the pair $(U(x) = 1, V(x) = 0)$.

(ii) The case

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

corresponds to $m = 1, D = (P)$ and the pair $(U(x) = x - a, V(x) = b)$.

- (iii) Let $m \leq g$ be a positive integer and I an m -element subset of the $(2g+1)$ -element set $\{1, \dots, 2g, 2g+1\}$ of positive integers. Let us consider a degree m effective divisor

$$D_{m,I} = \sum_{i \in I} (\mathfrak{W}_i)$$

on \mathcal{C} . Then the degree zero divisor $D_{m,I} - m(\infty)$ is reduced and its linear equivalence class $\mathfrak{a}_{m,I} := \text{cl}(D_{m,I} - m(\infty))$ has order 2 in $J(K)$, because

$$2\text{cl}(D_{m,I} - m(\infty)) = \text{cl} \left(\left(\sum_{i \in I} 2(\mathfrak{W}_i) \right) - 2m(\infty) \right) = \text{div} \left(\prod_{i \in I} (x - \alpha_i) \right).$$

Let us consider the polynomials

$$U(x) = U_{m,I}(x) := \prod_{i \in I} (x - \alpha_i), \quad V(x) = V_{m,I}(x) := 0.$$

Since $f(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i)$ is obviously divisible by $U_{m,I}(x)$,

$$f(x) - V_{m,I}(x)^2 = f(x) - 0^2 = f(x)$$

is divisible by $U_{m,I}(x)$. It follows that $(U_{m,I}(x), 0)$ is the Mumford representation of $\mathfrak{a}_{m,I}$, since $\mathfrak{W}_i = (\alpha_i, 0)$ for all i .

Clearly, distinct pairs (m, I) correspond to distinct points $\mathfrak{a}_{m,I}$. Notice that the number of all (m, I) 's equals $2^{2g} - 1$ (one has to subtract 1, because we exclude $m = 0$ and empty I). At the same time, $2^{2g} - 1$ is the number of elements of order 2 in $J(K)$. This implies that every order 2 point in $J(K)$ is of the form for exactly one (m, I) . Thus, we obtain the Mumford representations for all nonzero halves of zero in $J(K)$.

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

Let $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$, i.e.,

$$a, b \in K, \quad b^2 = f(a) = \prod_{i=1}^n (a - \alpha_i).$$

Recall that our goal is to divide explicitly P by 2 in $J(K)$, i.e., to give explicit formulas for the *Mumford representation* of all 2^{2g} divisor classes $\text{cl}(D - m(\infty))$ (with reduced $D - m(\infty)$) such that $2D - 2m(\infty)$ is linearly equivalent to $(P) - (\infty)$, i.e., the divisor $2D + \iota(P)$ is linearly equivalent to $(2m+1)(\infty)$. (It turns out that each such D has degree g and its support does not contain any of \mathfrak{W}_i .)

The following assertion is a simple but useful exercise in Riemann-Roch spaces (see Example 4.13 in [11]).

Lemma 2.2. *Let D be an effective divisor on \mathcal{C} of degree $m > 0$ such that $m \leq 2g+1$ and $\text{supp}(D)$ does not contain ∞ . Assume that the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is principal.*

(1) *Suppose that m is odd. Then:*

- (i) *$m = 2g + 1$ and there exists exactly one polynomial $v(x) \in K[x]$ such that the divisor of $y - v(x)$ coincides with $D - (2g+1)(\infty)$. In addition, $\deg(v) \leq g$.*
- (ii) *If \mathfrak{W}_i lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then it appears in D with multiplicity 1.*

- (iii) If b is a nonzero element of K and $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$.
- (2) Suppose that $m = 2d$ is even. Then there exists exactly one monic degree d polynomial $u(x) \in K[x]$ such that the divisor of $u(x)$ coincides with $D - m(\infty)$. In particular, every point $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ appears in $D - m(\infty)$ with the same multiplicity as $\iota(Q)$.

Proof. Let h be a rational function on \mathcal{C} , whose divisor coincides with $D - m(\infty)$. Since ∞ is the only pole of h , the function h is a polynomial in x, y and therefore may be presented as $h = s(x)y - v(x)$ with $s, v \in K[x]$. If $s = 0$ then h has at ∞ the pole of even order $2 \deg(v)$ and therefore $m = 2 \deg(v)$.

Suppose that $s \neq 0$. Clearly, $s(x)y$ has at ∞ the pole of odd order $2 \deg(s) + (2g + 1) \geq (2g + 1)$. So, the orders of the pole for $s(x)y$ and $v(x)$ are distinct, because they have different parity. Therefore the order m of the pole of $h = s(x)y - v(x)$ coincides with $\max(2 \deg(s) + (2g + 1), 2 \deg(v)) \geq 2g + 1$. This implies that $m = 2g + 1$; in particular, m is odd. It follows that m is even if and only if $s(x) = 0$, i.e., $h = -v(x)$; in addition, $\deg(v) \leq (2g + 1)/2$, i.e., $\deg(v) \leq g$. In order to finish the proof of (2), it suffices to divide $-v(x)$ by its leading coefficient and denote the ratio by $u(x)$. (The uniqueness of monic $u(x)$ is obvious.)

Let us prove (1). Since m is odd,

$$m = 2 \deg(s) + (2g + 1) > 2 \deg(v).$$

Since $m \leq 2g + 1$, we obtain that $\deg(s) = 0$, i.e., s is a nonzero element of K and $2 \deg(v) < 2g + 1$. The latter inequality means that $\deg(v) \leq g$. Dividing h by the constant s , we may and will assume that $s = 1$ and therefore $h = y - v(x)$ with

$$v(x) \in K[x], \quad \deg(v) \leq g.$$

This proves (i). (The uniqueness of v is obvious.) The assertion (ii) is contained in Proposition 13.2(b) on pp. 409-10 of [13]. In order to prove (iii), we just follow arguments on p. 410 of [13] (where it is actually proven). Notice that our $P = (a, b)$ is a zero of $y - v(x)$, i.e. $b - v(a) = 0$. Since, $b \neq 0$, $v(a) = b \neq 0$ and $y - v(x)$ takes on at $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ the value $-b - v(a) = -2b \neq 0$. This implies that $\iota(P)$ is not a zero of $y - v(x)$, i.e., $\iota(P)$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$. \square

Remark 2.3. Lemma 2.2(1)(ii,iii) asserts that if m is odd then the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is *semi-reduced*. See [13, the penultimate paragraph on p. 411].

Corollary 2.4. *Let $P = (a, b)$ be a K -point on \mathcal{C} and D an effective divisor on \mathcal{C} such that $m = \deg(D) \leq g$ and $\text{supp}(D)$ does not contain ∞ . Suppose that the degree zero divisor $2D + \iota(P) - (2m + 1)(\infty)$ is principal. Then:*

- (i) $m = g$ and there exists a polynomial $v_D(x) \in K[x]$ such that $\deg(v_D) \leq g$ and the divisor of $y - v_D(x)$ coincides with $2D + \iota(P) - (2g + 1)(\infty)$. In particular, $-b = v_D(a)$.
- (ii) If a point Q lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then $\iota(Q)$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$. In particular,
 - (1) none of \mathfrak{W}_i lies in $\text{supp}(D)$;
 - (2) $D - g(\infty)$ is reduced.
- (iii) The point P does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$.

Proof. One has only to apply Lemma 2.2 to the divisor $2D + \iota(P)$ of odd degree $2m+1 \leq 2g+1$ and notice that $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ is a zero of $y-v(x)$ while $\iota(\mathfrak{W}_i) = \mathfrak{W}_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 2g+1$. \square

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

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

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

Theorem 2.5. *Suppose that $g > 1$ and let*

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

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

$$\mathcal{C} \cap 2 \cdot \Theta = \{0\}.$$

Remark 2.6. The case $g = 2$ of Theorem 2.5 was done in [2, Prop. 1.5]

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Suppose that $m \leq g-1$ is a positive integer and we have m (not necessarily distinct) points Q_1, \dots, Q_m of $\mathcal{C}(K)$ and a point $P \in \mathcal{C}(K)$ such that in $J(K)$

$$2 \sum_{j=1}^m Q_j = P.$$

We need to prove that $P = \infty$, i.e., it is the zero of group law in J and therefore $\sum_{j=1}^m Q_j$ is an element of order 2 (or 1) in $J(K)$. Suppose that this is not true. Decreasing m if necessary, we may and will assume that none of Q_j is ∞ (but m is still positive and does not exceed $g-1$). Let us consider the effective degree m divisor $D = \sum_{j=1}^m (Q_j)$ on \mathcal{C} . The equality in J means that the divisors $2[D - m(\infty)]$ and $(P) - (\infty)$ on \mathcal{C} are linearly equivalent. This means that the divisor $2D + (\iota(P)) - (2m+1)(\infty)$ is *principal*. Now Corollary 2.4 tells us that $m = g$, which is not the case. The obtained contradiction proves that the intersection of $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ and Θ consists of points of order 2 and 1.

Since $g > 1$, $\mathcal{C} \subset \Theta$ and therefore the intersection of \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ also consists of points of order 2 or 1, i.e., lies in the union of ∞ and all \mathfrak{W}_i 's. Conversely, since each \mathfrak{W}_i has order 2 in $J(K)$ and ∞ has order 1, they all lie in $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ (and, of course, in \mathcal{C}). \square

Remark 2.7. It is known [10, Ch. VI, last paragraph of Sect. 11, p. 122] that the curve $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ is irreducible. (Its projectiveness and smoothness follow readily from the projectiveness of J and \mathcal{C} , the smoothness of \mathcal{C} and the étaleness of multiplication by 2 in J .) See [4] for an explicit description of equations that cut out $\mathcal{C}_{1/2}$ in a projective space.

Corollary 2.8. *Suppose that $g > 1$. Let m be an integer such that $3 \leq m \leq 2g$. Then $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does not contain a point of order m in $J(K)$. In particular, $\mathcal{C}(K)$ does not contain points of order 3 or 4.*

Remark 2.9. The case $g = 2$ of Corollary 2.8 was done in [2, Prop. 2.1]

Proof of Corollary 2.8. Suppose that such a point say, P does exist. Clearly, P is neither ∞ nor one of \mathfrak{M}_i , i.e., $P \neq \iota(P)$. Let us consider the effective degree m divisor $D = m(P)$. Then the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is principal and its support contains P but does not contain $\iota(P)$.

If m is odd then the desired result follows from Lemma 2.2(1). Assume that m is even. By Lemma 2.2(2), the support of $D - m(\infty)$ must contain $\iota(P)$, since it contains P . This gives us a contradiction that ends the proof. \square

Example 2.10. Let us assume that $\text{char}(K)$ does not divide $(2g + 1)$. Then for every nonzero $b \in K$ the monic degree $(2g + 1)$ polynomial $x^{2g+1} + b^2$ has no multiple roots and the point $P = (0, b)$ of the genus g hyperelliptic curve

$$\mathcal{C} : y^2 = x^{2g+1} + b^2$$

has order $(2g + 1)$ on the jacobian J of \mathcal{C} . Indeed, the polar divisor of rational function $y - b$ is $(2g + 1)(\infty)$ while P is its only zero. Since the degree of $\text{div}(y - b)$ is 0,

$$\text{div}(y - b) = (2g + 1)(P) - (2g + 1)(\infty) = (2g + 1)((P) - (\infty)).$$

This means that the K -point

$$P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)$$

has finite order m that divides $2g + 1$. Clearly, m is neither 1 nor 2 (since $P \neq \infty$ and $y(P) = b \neq 0$), i.e., $m \geq 3$. If $m < (2g + 1)$ then $m \leq 2g$ and we get a contradiction to Corollary 2.8. This proves that the order of P is $(2g + 1)$.

Notice that odd degree genus 2 hyperelliptic curves with points of order $5 = 2 \times 2 + 1$ are classified in [3].

Remark 2.11. If $\text{char}(K) = 0$ and $g > 1$ then the famous theorem of M. Raynaud (conjectured by Yu.I. Manin and D. Mumford) asserts that an arbitrary genus g smooth projective curve over K embedded into its jacobian contains only finitely many torsion points [7].

The aim of the rest of this section is to obtain an information about torsion points on certain subvarieties Θ_d when \mathcal{C} has ‘‘large monodromy’’. In what follows we use the notation $[?]$ for the lower integral part of a real number $[?]$.

Let us start with the following assertion.

Theorem 2.12. *Suppose that $g > 1$ and let N and k be positive integers such that*

$$k < N, \quad N + k \leq 2g.$$

Let us put

$$d_{(N+k)} = \left\lfloor \frac{2g}{N+k} \right\rfloor.$$

Let K_0 be a subfield of K such that $f(x) \in K_0[x]$. Let $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ lies on $\Theta_{d_{(N+k)}}$. Suppose that there exists a collection of k (not necessarily distinct) field automorphisms

$$\{\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_k\} \subset \text{Aut}(K/K_0)$$

such that $\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\mathbf{a}) = N\mathbf{a}$ or $-N\mathbf{a}$. Then \mathbf{a} has order 1 or 2 in $J(K)$.

Proof. Clearly,

$$d_{(N+k)} \leq \frac{2g}{N+k} \leq \frac{2g}{2+1} < g; \quad (N+k) \cdot d_{(N+k)} \leq 2g < 2g+1.$$

Let us assume that $2\mathbf{a} \neq 0$ in $J(K)$. We need to arrive to a contradiction. There are a positive integer $r \leq d_{(N+k)} < g$ and a sequence of points P_1, \dots, P_r of $\mathcal{C}(K) \setminus \{\infty\}$ such that the linear equivalence class of $\tilde{D} := \sum_{j=1}^r (P_j) - r(\infty)$ equals \mathbf{a} . We may assume that r is the smallest positive integer that enjoys this property for given \mathbf{a} . Then the divisor \tilde{D} is *reduced*. Indeed, if \tilde{D} is *not* reduced then $r \geq 2$ and we may assume without loss of generality that (say) $P_r = \iota(P_{r-1})$, i.e., the divisor $(P_{r-1}) + (P_r) - 2(\infty)$ is principal. Since $\mathbf{a} \neq 0$, $r > 2$ and therefore \tilde{D} is linear equivalent to

$$\tilde{D} - ((P_{r-1}) + (P_r) - 2(\infty)) = \sum_{j=1}^{r-2} (P_j) - (r-2)(\infty).$$

This contradicts to the minimality of r , and this contradiction proves that \tilde{D} is reduced.

We may assume that (say) P_1 does *not* coincide with any of \mathfrak{W}_i (here we use the assumption that $2\mathbf{a} \neq 0$); we may also assume that P_1 has the largest *multiplicity* in \tilde{D} among $\{P_1, \dots, P_r\}$; let us denote this multiplicity by M . Since \tilde{D} is reduced, none of P_j 's coincides with ιP_1 . The divisor $\sigma_l(\tilde{D}) = \sum_{j=1}^r (\sigma_l P_j) - r(\infty)$ is also reduced and its linear equivalence class equals $\sigma_l \mathbf{a}$ for all $l \in \{1, \dots, k\}$. In particular, the multiplicity of each $\sigma_l P_j$ in $\sigma_l(\tilde{D})$ does *not* exceed M ; similarly, the multiplicity of each $\iota \sigma_l P_j$ in $\iota \sigma_l(\tilde{D})$ also does *not* exceed M for every l . This implies that if P is any point of $\mathcal{C}(K) \setminus \{\infty\}$ that does *not* lie in the support of \tilde{D} then its multiplicity in $N\tilde{D} + \iota \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right)$ is a nonnegative integer that does *not* exceed kM ; in addition, the multiplicity of P in $N\tilde{D} + \sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D})$ is also a nonnegative integer that also does *not* exceed kM . Notice also that P_1 lies in the supports of both $N\tilde{D} + \iota \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right)$ and $N\tilde{D} + \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right)$ and its multiplicities (in both cases) are, at least, NM .

Suppose that $\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\mathbf{a}) = N\mathbf{a}$. Then the divisor

$$N\tilde{D} + \iota \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right) = N \left(\sum_{j=1}^r (P_j) \right) + \sum_{l=1}^k \left(\sum_{j=1}^r (\iota \sigma_l P_j) \right) - r(N+k)(\infty)$$

is a *principal divisor* on \mathcal{C} . Since

$$m := r(N+k) \leq (N+k) \cdot d_{(N+k)} \leq 2g < 2g+1,$$

we are in position to apply Lemma 2.2, which tells us right away that m is *even* and there is a monic polynomial $u(x)$ of degree $m/2$, whose divisor coincides with $N\tilde{D} + \iota \sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D})$. This implies that any point $Q \in \mathcal{C}(K) \setminus \{\infty\}$ appears in $N\tilde{D} + \iota \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right)$ with the same (nonnegative) multiplicity as ιQ . It follows that $Q = \iota P_1$ appears in $N\tilde{D} + \iota \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) \right)$ with the same multiplicity as P_1 . On the other hand, since ιP_1 does *not* appear in \tilde{D} , its multiplicity in $N\tilde{D} + \iota \sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D})$

does *not* exceed kM . Since the multiplicity of P_1 in $N\tilde{D} + \iota\left(\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D})\right)$ is, at least, NM , we conclude that $NM \leq kM$, which is not the case, since $k < N$. This gives us the desired contradiction.

If $\sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\mathbf{a}) = -N\mathbf{a}$ then literally the same arguments applied to the principal divisor

$$N\tilde{D} + \sum_{l=1}^k \sigma_l(\tilde{D}) = N \left(\sum_{j=1}^r (P_j) \right) + \sum_{l=1}^k \left(\sum_{j=1}^r (\sigma_l P_j) \right) - r(N+k)(\infty)$$

also lead to the contradiction. \square

2.13. Let K_0 be a subfield of K such that $f(x) \in K_0[x]$ and \bar{K}_0 the algebraic closure of K_0 in K . (E.g., one may take as K_0 the field that is generated over the prime subfield of K by all the coefficients of $f(x)$.) We write $\text{Gal}(K_0)$ for the absolute Galois group

$$\text{Gal}(K_0) = \text{Aut}(\bar{K}_0/K)$$

of K_0 . It is well known that all torsion points of $J(K)$ actually lie in $J(\bar{K}_0)$.

Let us consider the following Galois properties of torsion points of $J(K)$.

- (M3) If $\mathbf{a} \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ has finite order that is a power of 2 then there exists $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(K_0)$ such that $\sigma(\mathbf{a}) = 3\mathbf{a}$.
- (M2) If $\mathbf{b} \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ has finite order that is odd then there exists $\tau \in \text{Gal}(K_0)$ such that $\tau(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}$.
- (M) Let $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ be points of finite order such that the order of \mathbf{a} is a power of 2 and the order of \mathbf{b} is odd. Then there exist $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0)$ such that

$$\sigma_1(\mathbf{a}) = -\mathbf{a}, \sigma_1(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}; \sigma_2(\mathbf{a}) = 5\mathbf{a}, \sigma_2(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}.$$

Theorem 2.14. (i) *Suppose that $g \geq 2$ and J enjoys the property (M3). Let us put*

$$d_{(4)} = [2g/4] = [g/2].$$

Let $\mathbf{a} \in J(K)$ be a torsion point that lies on $\Theta_{d_{(4)}}$.

If the order of \mathbf{a} is a power of 2 then it is either 1 or 2.

- (ii) *Suppose that $g \geq 2$ and J enjoys the property (M2). Let us put*

$$d_{(3)} = [2g/3].$$

Let $\mathbf{b} \in J(K)$ be a torsion point of odd order that lies on $\Theta_{d_{(3)}}$.

Then $\mathbf{b} = 0 \in J(K)$.

- (iii) *Suppose that $g \geq 3$ and J enjoys the property (M). Let us put*

$$d_{(6)} = [2g/6] = [g/3].$$

Let $\mathbf{c} \in J(K)$ be a torsion point that lies on $\Theta_{d_{(6)}}$.

Then the order of \mathbf{c} is either 1 or 2.

Remark 2.15. In the case of $g = 2$ an analogue of Theorem 2.14(i,ii) was earlier proven in [2, Cor. 1.6].

Proof of Theorem 2.14. Since all torsion points of $J(K)$ lie in $J(\bar{K}_0)$, we may assume that $K = \bar{K}_0$ and therefore $\text{Gal}(K_0) = \text{Aut}(K/K_0)$. In the first two cases the assertion follows readily from Theorem 2.12 with $N = 3, k = 1$ in the case (i) and with $N = 2, k = 1$ in the case (ii). Let us do the case (iii). We have

$\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ where the order of \mathbf{a} is odd and the order of \mathbf{b} is a power of 2. There exist $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0) = \text{Aut}(K/K_0)$ such that

$$\sigma_1(\mathbf{a}) = -\mathbf{a}, \sigma_1(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}; \sigma_2(\mathbf{a}) = 5\mathbf{a}, \sigma_2(\mathbf{b}) = 2\mathbf{b}.$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1(\mathbf{c}) + \sigma_2(\mathbf{c}) &= \sigma_1(\mathbf{a}) + \sigma_1(\mathbf{b}) + \sigma_2(\mathbf{a}) + \sigma_2(\mathbf{b}) = -\mathbf{a} + 2\mathbf{b} + 5\mathbf{a} + 2\mathbf{b} = 4(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}) = 4\mathbf{c}, \\ \text{i.e., } \sigma_1(\mathbf{c}) + \sigma_2(\mathbf{c}) &= 4\mathbf{c}. \end{aligned}$$

Now the desired result follows from Theorem 2.12 with $N = 4, k = 2$. \square

Example 2.16. Suppose that $g > 1$ and K is the field \mathbb{C} of complex numbers, $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}\}$ is a $(2g+1)$ -element set of algebraically independent transcendental complex numbers and $K_0 = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1})$ where \mathbb{Q} is the field of rational numbers. It follows from results of B. Poonen and M. Stoll [6, Th. 7.1 and its proof] and J. Yelton [14, Th. 1.1 and Prop. 2.2] that the jacobian J of the generic hyperelliptic curve

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

enjoys the following properties.

Let us choose odd integers $(2n_1 + 1)$ and $(2n_2 + 1)$ and nonnegative integers m_1 and m_2 . Suppose that $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ be points of finite order such that the order of \mathbf{a} is a power of 2 and the order of \mathbf{b} is odd. Then there exist $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0)$ such that

$$\sigma_1(\mathbf{a}) = (2n_1 + 1)\mathbf{a}, \sigma_1(\mathbf{b}) = 2^{m_1}\mathbf{b}; \sigma_2(\mathbf{a}) = (2n_2 + 1)\mathbf{a}, \sigma_2(\mathbf{b}) = 2^{m_2}\mathbf{b}.$$

Choosing $n_1 = 1$, we obtain that J enjoys the property (M3). Choosing $m_1 = 1$, we obtain that J enjoys the property (M2). Choosing

$$n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2, m_1 = m_2 = 1,$$

we obtain that J enjoys the property (M). It follows from Theorem 2.14 that torsion points of $J(\mathbb{C})$ enjoy the following properties.

- (i) Any torsion point $\mathbf{a} \in J(\mathbb{C})$ that lies on $\Theta_{[g/2]}$ and has order that is a power of 2 actually has order 1 or 2.
- (ii) If $\mathbf{b} \in J(\mathbb{C})$ is a torsion point of odd order that lies on $\Theta_{[2g/3]}$ then $\mathbf{b} = 0 \in J(\mathbb{C})$.
- (iii) Let $g \geq 3$. Then any torsion point $\mathbf{c} \in J(\mathbb{C})$ that lies on $\Theta_{[g/3]}$ has order 1 or 2.

Notice that B. Poonen and M. Stoll [6, Th. 7.1] proved that the only complex points of finite order in $J(\mathbb{C})$ that lie on $\mathcal{C} = \Theta_1$ are points of order 1 or 2. On the other hand, it is well known that J is a simple complex abelian variety. Now a theorem of Raynaud [8] implies that the set of torsion points on the theta divisor $\Theta = \Theta_{g-1}$ (actually, on every proper closed subvariety) of J is finite.

3. DIVISION BY 2

If n and i are positive integers and $\mathbf{r} = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\}$ is a sequence of n elements $r_i \in K$ then we write

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \dots, r_n) \in K$$

for the i th basic symmetric function in r_1, \dots, r_n . If we put $r_{n+1} = 0$ then $\mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \dots, r_n) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \dots, r_n, r_{n+1})$.

Suppose we are given a point

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

Since $\dim(J) = g$, there are exactly 2^{2g} points $\mathfrak{a} \in J(K)$ such that

$$P = 2\mathfrak{a} \in J(K).$$

Let us choose such an \mathfrak{a} . Then there is exactly one effective divisor

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) \tag{1}$$

of positive degree m on \mathcal{C} such that $\text{supp}(D)$ does *not* contain ∞ , the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is reduced, and

$$m \leq g, \text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = \mathfrak{a}.$$

It follows that the divisor $2D + (\iota(P)) - (2m + 1)(\infty)$ is *principal* and, thanks to Corollary 2.4, $m = g$ and $\text{supp}(D)$ does *not* contains any of \mathfrak{W}_i . (In addition, $D - g(\infty)$ is reduced.) Then degree g effective divisor

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j) \tag{2}$$

with $Q_i = (c_j, d_j) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$. Since none of Q_j coincides with any of \mathfrak{W}_i ,

$$c_j \neq \alpha_i \quad \forall i, j.$$

By Corollary 2.4, there is a polynomial $v_D(x)$ of degree $\leq g$ such that the degree zero divisor

$$2D + (\iota(P)) - (2g + 1)(\infty)$$

is the divisor of $y - v_D(x)$. Since $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$ and all Q_j 's are zeros of $y - v_D(x)$,

$$b = -v_D(a), \quad d_j = v_D(c_j) \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, g.$$

It follows from Proposition 13.2 on pp. 409–410 of [13] that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i) - v_D(x)^2 = f(x) - v_D(x)^2 = (x - a) \prod_{j=1}^g (x - c_j)^2. \tag{3}$$

In particular, $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$ is divisible by

$$u_D(x) := \prod_{j=1}^g (x - c_j). \tag{4}$$

Remark 3.1. Summing up:

$$D = D(\mathfrak{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j)) \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, g$$

and the degree g monic polynomial $u_D(x) = \prod_{j=1}^g (x - c_j)$ divides $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$. Thus (see the beginning of Section 2), the pair (u_D, v_D) is the Mumford representation of \mathfrak{a} if

$$\deg(v_D) < g = \deg(u_D).$$

This is not always the case: it may happen that $\deg(v_D) = g = \deg(u_D)$ (see below). However, if we replace $v_D(x)$ by its remainder with respect to the division by $u_D(x)$ then we get the Mumford representation of \mathfrak{a} (see below).

If in (3) we put $x = \alpha_i$ then we get

$$-v_D(\alpha_i)^2 = (\alpha_i - a) \left(\prod_{j=1}^g (\alpha_i - c_j) \right)^2,$$

i.e.,

$$v_D(\alpha_i)^2 = (a - \alpha_i) \left(\prod_{j=1}^g (c_j - \alpha_i) \right)^2 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g + 1.$$

Since none of $c_j - \alpha_i$ vanishes, we may define

$$r_i = r_{i,D} := \frac{v_D(\alpha_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^g (c_j - \alpha_i)} = (-1)^g \frac{v_D(\alpha_i)}{u_D(\alpha_i)} \quad (5)$$

with

$$r_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g + 1 \quad (6)$$

and

$$\alpha_i = a - r_i^2, \quad c_j - \alpha_i = r_i^2 - a + c_j \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g + 1; j = 1, \dots, g.$$

Clearly, all r_i 's are *distinct* elements of K , because their squares are obviously distinct. (By the same token, $r_{j_1} \neq \pm r_{j_2}$ if $j_1 \neq j_2$.) Notice that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = \pm b, \quad (7)$$

because

$$b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (a - \alpha_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i^2. \quad (8)$$

Now we get

$$r_i = \frac{v_D(a - r_i^2)}{\prod_{j=1}^g (r_i^2 - a + c_j)},$$

i.e.,

$$r_i \prod_{j=1}^g (r_i^2 - a + c_j) - v_D(a - r_i^2) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g + 1.$$

This means that the degree $(2g + 1)$ monic polynomial (recall that $\deg(v_D) \leq g$)

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := t \prod_{j=1}^g (t^2 - a + c_j) - v_D(a - t^2)$$

has $(2g + 1)$ *distinct* roots r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1} . This means that

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (t - r_i).$$

Clearly, $t \prod_{j=1}^g (t^2 - a + c_j)$ coincides with the *odd part* of $h_{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ while $-v_D(a - t^2)$ coincides with the *even part* of $h_{\mathbf{r}}(t)$. In particular, if we put $t = 0$ then we get

$$(-1)^{2g+1} \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -v_D(a) = b,$$

i.e.,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b. \quad (9)$$

Hereafter

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}_D := (r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1}) \in K^{2g+1}.$$

Since

$$\mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{s}_i(r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1})$$

is the i th basic symmetric function in r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1} ,

$$h_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} (-1)^i \mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) t^{2g+1-i} = \left[t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g} (-1)^i \mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r}) t^{2g+1-i} \right] + b.$$

(Since

$$\mathbf{s}_{2g+1}(\mathbf{r}) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b,$$

the constant term of $h_{\mathbf{r}}(t)$ equals b .) Then

$$\begin{aligned} t \prod_{j=1}^g (t^2 - a + c_j) &= t^{2g+1} + \sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r}) t^{2g+1-2j}, \\ -v_D(a - t^2) &= \left[-\sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r}) t^{2g-2j+2} \right] + b. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=1}^g (t - a + c_j) &= t^g + \sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r}) t^{g-j}, \\ v_D(a - t) &= \sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r}) t^{g-j+1} - b. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$v_D(t) = \left[\sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r}) (a - t)^{g-j+1} \right] - b. \quad (10)$$

It is also clear that if we consider the degree g monic polynomial

$$U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := u_D(t) = \prod_{j=1}^g (t - c_j)$$

then

$$U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) = (-1)^g \left[(a - t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r}) (a - t)^{g-j} \right]. \quad (11)$$

Recall that $\deg(v_D) \leq g$ and notice that the coefficient of $v_D(x)$ at x^g is $(-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r})$. This implies that the polynomial

$$V_{\mathbf{r}}(t) := v_D(t) - (-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) U_{\mathbf{r}}(t) =$$

$$\left[\sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j-1}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j+1} \right] - b - \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) \left[(a-t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^g \mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r})(a-t)^{g-j} \right] = \sum_{j=1}^g (\mathbf{s}_{2j+1}(\mathbf{r}) - \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r})\mathbf{s}_{2j}(\mathbf{r})) (a-t)^{g-j} \quad (12)$$

has degree $< g$, i.e.,

$$\deg(V_{\mathbf{r}}) < \deg(U_{\mathbf{r}}) = g.$$

Clearly, $f(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)^2$ is still divisible by $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$, because $u_D(x) = U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ divides both $f(x) - v_D(x)^2$ and $v_D(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$. On the other hand,

$$d_j = v_D(c_j) = V_{\mathbf{r}}(c_j) \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, g,$$

because $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ divides $v_D(x) - V_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ and vanishes at all c_j . Actually, $\{c_1, \dots, c_g\}$ is the list of all roots (with multiplicities) of $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$. So,

$$D = D(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j)) = (c_j, V_{\mathbf{r}}(c_j)) \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, g.$$

This implies (again via the beginning of Section 2) that the pair $(U_{\mathbf{r}}(x), V_{\mathbf{r}}(x))$ is the *Mumford representation* of $\text{cl}(D - g(\infty)) = \mathbf{a}$. So, the formulas (11) and (12) give us an explicit construction of $(D(\mathbf{a}))$ and \mathbf{a} in terms of $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1})$ for each of 2^{2g} choices of \mathbf{a} with $2\mathbf{a} = P \in J(K)$. On the other hand, in light of (6)-(8), there is exactly the same number 2^{2g} of choices of collections of square roots $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ ($1 \leq i \leq 2g$) with product $-b$. Combining it with (9), we obtain that for each choice of square roots $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$'s with $\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} = -b$ there is precisely one $\mathbf{a} \in J(K)$ with $2\mathbf{a} = P$ such that the corresponding r_i defined by (5) coincides with chosen $\sqrt{a - \alpha_i}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 2g + 1$, and the Mumford representation $(U_{\mathbf{r}}(x), V_{\mathbf{r}}(x))$ for this \mathbf{a} is given by formulas (11)-(12). This gives us the following assertion.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $P = (a, b) \in \mathcal{C}(K)$. Then the 2^{2g} -element set*

$$M_{1/2, P} := \{\mathbf{a} \in J(K) \mid 2\mathbf{a} = P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K)\}$$

can be described as follows. Let $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$ be the set of all $(2g + 1)$ -tuples $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1})$ of elements of K such that

$$r_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g + 1; \quad \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b.$$

Let $\mathbf{s}_i(\mathbf{r})$ be the i th basic symmetric function in r_1, \dots, r_{2g+1} . Let us put

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

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

Then there is a natural bijection between $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$ and $M_{1/2, P}$ such that $\mathbf{r} \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$ corresponds to $\mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{r}} \in M_{1/2, P}$ with Mumford representation $(U_{\mathbf{r}}, V_{\mathbf{r}})$. More explicitly, if $\{c_1, \dots, c_g\}$ is the list of all g roots (with multiplicities) of $U_{\mathbf{r}}(x)$ then \mathbf{r}

corresponds to

$$\mathbf{a}_\tau = \text{cl}(D - g(\infty)) \in J(K), \quad 2\mathbf{a}_\tau = P$$

where the divisor

$$D = D(\mathbf{a}_\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^g (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, V_\tau(c_j)) \in \mathcal{C}(K) \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, g.$$

In addition, none of α_i is a root of $U_\tau(x)$ (i.e., the polynomials $U_\tau(x)$ and $f(x)$ are relatively prime) and

$$\tau_i = \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) + (-1)^g \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g+1.$$

Proof. Actually we have already proven all the assertions of Theorem 3.2 except the last formula for τ_i . It follows from (4) and (5) that

$$\tau_i = (-1)^g \frac{v_{D(\mathbf{a}_\tau)}(\alpha_i)}{u_{D(\mathbf{a}_\tau)}(\alpha_i)} = (-1)^g \frac{v_{D(\mathbf{a}_\tau)}(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)}.$$

It follows from (12) that

$$v_{D(\mathbf{a}_\tau)}(x) = (-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) U_\tau(x) + V_\tau(x).$$

This implies that

$$\tau_i = (-1)^g \frac{(-1)^g \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) U_\tau(\alpha_i) + V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)} = \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) + (-1)^g \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)}.$$

□

Corollary 3.3. *We keep the notation and assumptions of Theorem 3.2. Then*

$$2g \cdot \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) = (-1)^{g+1} \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)}.$$

In particular, if $\text{char}(K)$ does not divide g then

$$\mathbf{s}_1(\tau) = \frac{(-1)^{g+1}}{2g} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)}.$$

On the other hand, if $\text{char}(K)$ divides g then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)} = 0.$$

Proof. It follows from the last assertion of Theorem 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \tau_i = \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \left(\mathbf{s}_1(\tau) + (-1)^g \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)} \right) = \\ &= (2g+1)\mathbf{s}_1(\tau) + (-1)^g \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$0 = 2g \cdot \mathbf{s}_1(\tau) + (-1)^g \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_\tau(\alpha_i)}{U_\tau(\alpha_i)},$$

i.e.,

$$2g \cdot \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) = (-1)^{g+1} \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}.$$

□

Corollary 3.4. *We keep the notation and assumptions of Theorem 3.2. Let i, l be two distinct integers such that*

$$1 \leq i, l \leq 2g + 1.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{(-1)^g}{2} \times \frac{\left(\alpha_l + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 \right) - \left(\alpha_i + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 \right)}{\left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}, \quad \mathbf{r}_l = \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}.$$

Recall that

$$\mathbf{r}_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \neq a - \alpha_l = \mathbf{r}_l^2.$$

In particular,

$$\mathbf{r}_i \neq \mathbf{r}_l \quad \text{and therefore} \quad \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \neq \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_l - \alpha_i &= (a - \alpha_i) - (a - \alpha_l) = \mathbf{r}_i^2 - \mathbf{r}_l^2 = \\ &= \left(\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 - \left(\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) + (-1)^g \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 = \\ &= (-1)^g \cdot 2 \cdot \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right) + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$(-1)^g \cdot 2 \cdot \mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) \cdot \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right) = \left(\alpha_l + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 \right) - \left(\alpha_i + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 \right).$$

This means that

$$\mathbf{s}_1(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{(-1)^g}{2} \times \frac{\left(\alpha_l + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 \right) - \left(\alpha_i + \left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 \right)}{\left(\frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)}{U_{\mathbf{r}}(\alpha_l)} \right)}.$$

□

Remark 3.5. Let $\mathbf{r} = (\mathbf{r}_1, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{2g+1}) \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$ with $P = (a, b)$. Then for all $i = 1, \dots, 2g, 2g + 1$

$$(-\mathbf{r}_i)^2 = \mathbf{r}_i^2 = a - \alpha_i$$

and

$$\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (-\mathbf{r}_i) = (-1)^{2g+1} \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} \mathbf{r}_i = -(-b) = b.$$

This means that

$$-\mathfrak{r} = (-\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, -\mathfrak{r}_{2g+1}) \in \mathfrak{R}_{1/2, \iota(P)}$$

(recall that $\iota(P) = (a, -b)$). It follows from Theorem 3.2 that

$$U_{-\mathfrak{r}}(x) = U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x), \quad V_{-\mathfrak{r}}(x) = -V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$$

and therefore $\mathfrak{a}_{-\mathfrak{r}} = -\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$.

Remark 3.6. The last assertion of Theorem 3.2 combined with Corollary 3.4 allow us to reconstruct explicitly $\mathfrak{r} = (\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{2g+1})$ and $P = (a, b)$ if we are given the polynomials $U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x), V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x)$ (and, of course, $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{2g+1}\}$).

Example 3.7. Let us take as $P = (a, b)$ the point $\mathfrak{W}_{2g+1} = (\alpha_{2g+1}, 0)$. Then $b = 0$ and $\mathfrak{r}_{2g+1} = 0$. We have 2^{2g} arbitrary independent choices of (nonzero) square roots $\mathfrak{r}_i = \sqrt{\alpha_{2g+1} - \alpha_i}$ with $1 \leq i \leq 2g$ (and always get an element of $\mathfrak{R}_{1/2, P}$). Now Theorem 3.2 gives us (if we put $a = \alpha_{2g+1}, b = 0$) all 2^{2g} points $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ of order 4 in $J(K)$ with $2\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}} = \mathfrak{W}_{2g+1}$. Namely, let s_i be the i th basic symmetric function in $(\mathfrak{r}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{r}_{2g})$. Then the Mumford representation $(U_{\mathfrak{r}}, V_{\mathfrak{r}})$ of $\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{r}}$ is given by

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

$$V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^g (s_{2j+1} - s_1 s_{2j}) (\alpha_{2g+1} - x)^{g-j}.$$

In particular, if $\alpha_{2g+1} = 0$ then

$$\mathfrak{r}_i = \sqrt{-\alpha_i} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, 2g,$$

$$U_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) = x^g + \sum_{j=1}^g (-1)^j s_{2j} x^{g-j},$$

$$V_{\mathfrak{r}}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^g (s_{2j+1} - s_1 s_{2j}) (-x)^{g-j}.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] B.M. Bekker, Yu.G. Zarhin, *The divisibility by 2 of rational points on elliptic curves*. Algebra i Analiz **29:4** (2017), 196–239; St. Petersburg Math. J. **29** (2018), 683–713
- [2] J. Boxall and D. Grant, *Examples of torsion points on genus two curves*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), no. 10, 4533–4555.
- [3] J. Boxall, D. Grant and F. Leprévost, *5-torsion points on curves of genus 2*. J. London Math. Soc. (2) **64** (2001), 29–43.
- [4] N. Bruin and E.V. Flynn, *Towers of 2-covers of hyperelliptic curves*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), no. 11, 4329–4347.
- [5] D. Mumford, *Tata Lectures on Theta. II*. Progress in Math. **43**, Birkhäuser, Boston Basel Stuttgart, 1984.
- [6] B. Poonen and M. Stoll, *Most odd degree hyperelliptic curves have only one rational point*. Annals of Math. **180** (2014), Issue 3, 1137–1166.
- [7] M. Raynaud, *Courbes sur une variété abélienne et points de torsion*. Invent. Math. **71** (1983), no. 1, 207–233.
- [8] M. Raynaud, *Sous-variétés sur une variété abélienne et points de torsion*. In: Arithmetic and Geometry (Shafarevich Festschrift) I, pp. 327–352. Progress in Math. **35** Birkhäuser, Boston Basel Stuttgart, 1983.
- [9] E. Schaefer, *2-descent on the Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves*. J. Number Theory **51** (1995), no. 2, 219–232.

- [10] J.-P. Serre, Algebraic groups and class fields. Graduate Texts in Math. **117**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [11] M. Stoll, *Arithmetic of Hyperelliptic Curves*. Available at Summer Semester 2014, University of Bayreuth. <http://www.mathe2.uni-bayreuth.de/stoll/teaching/ArithHypKurven-SS2014/Skript-ArithHypCurves-pub-screen.pdf> .
- [12] M. Stoll, *Chabauty without the Mordell-Weil group*. In: Algorithmic and Experimental Methods in Algebra, Geometry, and Number Theory (G. Böckle, W. Decker, G. Malle, eds.), Springer-Verlag (2017), pp. 623–663.
- [13] L.C. Washington, *Elliptic Curves: Number Theory and Cryptography*. Second edition. Chapman & Hall/CRC Press, Boca Raton London New York, 2008.
- [14] J. Yelton, *Images of 2-adic representations associated to hyperelliptic jacobians*. J. Number Theory **151** (2015), 7–17.

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

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