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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, \( C : y^2 = f(x) \) the corresponding genus \( g \) hyperelliptic curve over \( K \), and \( J \) the jacobian of \( C \). We identify \( C \) with the image of its canonical embedding into \( J \) (the infinite point of \( C \) goes to the identity element of \( J \)). It is well known that for each \( b \in J(K) \) there are exactly \( 2^{2g} \) elements \( a \in J(K) \) such that \( 2a = b \). M. Stoll constructed an algorithm that provides Mumford representations of all such \( a \), in terms of the Mumford representation of \( b \). The aim of this paper is to give explicit formulas for Mumford representations of all such \( a \), when \( b \in J(K) \) is given by \( P = (a, b) \in C(K) \subset J(K) \) in terms of coordinates \( a, b \). We also prove that if \( g > 1 \) then \( C(K) \) 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 \( C \) 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 \( \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2g+1} \) are distinct elements of \( K \). It is well known that \( C \) is a genus \( g \) hyperelliptic curve over \( K \) with precisely one infinite point, which we denote by \( \infty \). In other words,

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

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

\[
\mathcal{M}_i = (\alpha_i, 0) \in C(K) \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1.
\]
We write \( \iota \) for the hyperelliptic involution

\[
\iota : C \to C, (x, y) \mapsto (x, -y), \ \infty \mapsto \infty.
\]

The set of all fixed points of \( \iota \) consists of \( \infty \) and all \( \mathfrak{M}_i \). 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 \( C \). If \( D \) is a divisor on \( C \) 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 \( C \), which is a \( g \)-dimensional abelian variety over \( K \). If \( D \) is a degree zero divisor on \( C \) 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 \( C \) with its image in \( J \) with respect to the canonical regular map \( C \to J \) under which \( \infty \) goes to the identity element of \( J \). In other words, a point \( P \in \mathcal{C}(K) \) is identified with \( \text{cl}((P) - (\infty)) \in J(K) \). Then the action of \( \iota \) on \( \mathcal{C}(K) \subset J(K) \) coincides with multiplication by \( -1 \) on \( J(K) \). In particular, the list of points of order 2 on \( C \) consists of all \( \mathfrak{M}_i \).

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

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

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

\[
b = \infty = 0 \in J(K)
\]

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 \( \Theta \) of \( J \) (rather than in \( J(K) \)) is \( \infty \). 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 \( \Theta \) 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 \( C \) 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].)
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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 \( \infty \), then the degree zero divisor \( D - m(\infty) \) is called semi-reduced if it enjoys the following properties.

- If \( W_i \) lies in \( \text{supp}(D) \) then it appears in \( D \) with multiplicity 1.
- If a point \( Q \) of \( C(K) \) lies in \( \text{supp}(D) \) and does not coincide with any of \( W_i \) 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 \( C(K) \) that is not one of \( W_i \)'s may appear 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 \( a \in J(K) \) there exist exactly one nonnegative \( m \) and (effective) degree \( m \) divisor \( D \) such that the degree zero divisor \( D - m(\infty) \) is reduced and \( \text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = a \).

(E.g., the zero divisor with \( m = 0 \) corresponds to \( a = 0 \).) If \( m \geq 1 \), \( D = \sum_{j=1}^{m} (Q_j) \) where \( Q_j = (a_j, b_j) \in C(K) \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, m \).

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

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

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 \( a \in J(K) \) 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.,
  \[ b_j = V(a_j), \quad Q_j = (a_j, V(a_j)) \in C(K) \text{ for all } j = 1, \ldots m. \]

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

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

(ii) The case \( a = P = (a, b) \in C(K) \subset J(K) \) 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 $\{1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1\}$ of positive integers. Let us consider a degree $m$ effective divisor

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

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

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

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 $a_{m,I}$, since $\mathfrak{M}_i = (\alpha_i, 0)$ for all $i$.

Clearly, distinct pairs $(m, I)$ correspond to distinct points $a_{m,I}$. 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 $a = \text{cl}(D - m(\infty))$ where $D - m(\infty)$ is a reduced divisor, such that $(U(x), V(x))$ is the Mumford representation of $a$.

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 $2D + \nu(P)$ 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 $\mathfrak{M}_i$.)

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 $\infty$. Assume that the divisor $D - m(\infty)$ is principal.

1. Suppose that $m$ is odd. Then:
   (i) $m = 2g + 1$ and there exists exactly one polynomial $v(x) \in K[x]$ such that the divisor of $y - v(x)$ coincides with $D - (2g + 1)(\infty)$. In addition, $\deg(v) \leq g$.
   (ii) If $\mathfrak{M}_i$ lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then it appears in $D$ with multiplicity 1.
(iii) If $b$ is a nonzero element of $K$ and $P = (a, b) \in C(K)$ lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then $\nu(P) = (a, -b)$ 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 $Q \in C(K)$ appears in $D - m(\infty)$ with the same multiplicity as $\nu(Q)$.

Proof. Let $h$ be a rational function on $C$, whose divisor coincides with $D - m(\infty)$. Since $\infty$ 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 $\infty$ 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 $\infty$ the pole of odd order $2 \deg(s) + (2g + 1) - (2g + 1) \geq 2g + 1$. 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,

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

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 $\nu(P) = (a, -b)$ the value $-b - v(a) = -2b \neq 0$. This implies that $\nu(P)$ is not a zero of $y - v(x)$, i.e., $\nu(P)$ 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 $C$ and $D$ an effective divisor on $C$ such that $m = \deg(D) \leq g$ and $\text{supp}(D)$ does not contain $\infty$. Suppose that the degree zero divisor $2D + \nu(P) - (2m + 1)(\infty)$ 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 $2D + \nu(P) - (2g + 1)(\infty)$. In particular, $-b = v_D(a)$.

(ii) If a point $Q$ lies in $\text{supp}(D)$ then $\nu(Q)$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$. In particular,

1. none of $M_i$ lies in $\text{supp}(D)$;
2. $D - g(\infty)$ is reduced.

(iii) The point $P$ does not lie in $\text{supp}(D)$.\[\square\]
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 $\iota(\mathcal{M}_i) = \mathcal{M}_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, 2g+1$. \qed

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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 $Q_1, \ldots, Q_m$ of $C(K)$ and a point $P \in C(K)$ 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 $\infty$ (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 $C$. The equality in $J$ means that the divisors $2[D - m(\infty)]$ and $(P) - (\infty)$ on $C$ 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 $C_{1/2}$ and $\Theta$ consists of points of order 2 and 1.

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

**Remark 2.7.** It is known [10, Ch. VI, last paragraph of Sect. 11, p. 122] that the curve $C_{1/2}$ is irreducible. (Its projectiveness and smoothness follow readily from the projectiveness of $J$ and $C$, the smoothness of $C$ and the étaleness of multiplication by 2 in $J$.) See [4] for an explicit description of equations that cut out $C_{1/2}$ 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 $\infty$ nor one of $W_i$, 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. □

**Example 2.10.** Let us assume that 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 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 $\Theta_d$ when $\mathcal{C}$ has “large monodromy”. In what follows we use the notation $[\cdot]$ 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 $k < N$, $N + k \leq 2g$.

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 $a \in J(K)$ lies on $\Theta_{d_{(N+k)}}$. Suppose that there exists a collection of $k$ (not necessarily distinct) field automorphisms

$$\{\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_k\} \subset \text{Aut}(K/K_0)$$
such that \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(a) = Na \) or \(-Na\). Then \( a \) 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 \( 2a \neq 0 \) 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 \( P_1, \ldots, P_r \) of \( C(K) \setminus \{\infty\} \) such that the linear equivalence class of \( \bar{D} := \sum_{j=1}^{r} (P_j) - r(\infty) \) equals \( a \). We may assume that \( r \) is the smallest positive integer that enjoys this property for given \( a \). Then the divisor \( \bar{D} \) is reduced. Indeed, if \( \bar{D} \) is not reduced then \( r \geq 2 \) and we may assume without loss of generality that (say) \( P_r = \bar{l}(P_{r-1}) \), i.e., the divisor \( (P_{r-1}) + (P_r) - 2(\infty) \) is principal. Since \( a \neq 0 \), \( r > 2 \) and therefore \( \bar{D} \) is linear equivalent to
\[
\bar{D} - ((P_{r-1}) + (P_r) - 2(\infty)) = \sum_{j=1}^{r-2} (P_j) - (r-2)(\infty).
\]

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

We may assume that (say) \( P_1 \) does not coincide with any of \( \mathfrak{M} \), (here we use the assumption that \( 2a \neq 0 \)); we may also assume that \( P_1 \) has the largest multiplicity in \( \bar{D} \) among \( \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\} \); let us denote this multiplicity by \( M \). Since \( \bar{D} \) is reduced, none of \( P_j \)'s coincides with \( \bar{l}P_1 \). The divisor \( \sigma_1(\bar{D}) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} (\sigma_1 P_j) - r(\infty) \) is also reduced and its linear equivalence class equals \( \sigma_1 a \) for all \( l \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). In particular, the multiplicity of each \( \sigma_1 P_j \) in \( \sigma_1(\bar{D}) \) does not exceed \( M \); similarly, the multiplicity of each \( \bar{a} \sigma_1 P_j \) in \( \bar{a} \sigma_1(\bar{D}) \) also does not exceed \( M \) for every \( l \). This implies that if \( P \) is any point of \( C(K) \setminus \{\infty\} \) that does not lie in the support of \( \bar{D} \) then its multiplicity in \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \) is a nonnegative integer that does not exceed \( kM \); in addition, the multiplicity of \( P \) in \( \bar{D} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \) is also a nonnegative integer that also does not exceed \( kM \). Notice also that \( P_1 \) lies in the supports of both \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \) and \( \bar{D} + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \) and its multiplicities (in both cases) are, at least, \( NM \).

Suppose that \( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(a) = Na \). Then the divisor
\[
\bar{D} + \epsilon \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \right) = N \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} (P_j) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{r} (\bar{a} \sigma_i P_j) \right) - r(N+k)(\infty)
\]
is a principal divisor on \( C \). 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 \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \). This implies that any point \( Q \in C(K) \setminus \{\infty\} \) appears in \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \) with the same (nonnegative) multiplicity as \( \bar{l}Q \). It follows that \( Q = \bar{l}P_1 \) appears in \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \left( \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \right) \) with the same multiplicity as \( P_1 \). On the other hand, since \( \bar{l}P_1 \) does not appear in \( \bar{D} \), its multiplicity in \( \bar{D} + \epsilon \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sigma_i(\bar{D}) \)
does not exceed $kM$. Since the multiplicity of $P_i$ in $N\bar{D} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\bar{D})$ 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 $\sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(a) = -Na$ then literally the same arguments applied to the principal divisor

$$N\bar{D} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sigma_i(\bar{D}) = N \left( \sum_{j=1}^r (P_j) \right) + \sum_{i=1}^k \left( \sum_{j=1}^r (\sigma_i P_j) \right) - r(N + k)(\infty)$$

also lead to the contradiction. \qed

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 $a \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ has finite order that is a power of 2 then there exists $\sigma \in \text{Gal}(\bar{K}_0)$ such that $\sigma(a) = 3a$.

(M2) If $b \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ has finite order that is odd then there exists $\tau \in \text{Gal}(\bar{K}_0)$ such that $\tau(b) = 2b$.

(M) Let $a, b \in J(\bar{K}_0)$ be points of finite order such that the order of $a$ is a power of 2 and the order of $b$ is odd. Then there exist $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0)$ such that

$$\sigma_1(a) = -a, \quad \sigma_1(b) = 2b; \quad \sigma_2(a) = 5a, \quad \sigma_2(b) = 2b.$$

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

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

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

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

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

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

Then the order of $c$ 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
\[ c = a + b \text{ where the order of } a \text{ is odd and the order of } b \text{ is a power of 2. There exist } \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0) = \text{Aut}(K/K_0) \text{ such that} \]
\[ \sigma_1(a) = -(a), \sigma_1(b) = 2b; \sigma_2(a) = 5a, \sigma_2(b) = 2b. \]

This implies that
\[ \sigma_1(c) + \sigma_2(c) = \sigma_1(a) + \sigma_1(b) + \sigma_2(a) + \sigma_2(b) = -(a) + 2b + 5a + 2b = 4(a + b) = 4c, \]
i.e., \( \sigma_1(c) + \sigma_2(c) = 4c. \) Now the desired result follows from Theorem 2.12 with \( N = 4, k = 2. \)

**Example 2.16.** Suppose that \( g > 1 \) and \( K \) is the field \( \mathbb{C} \) of complex numbers, \( \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2g+1}\} \) is a \((2g + 1)\)-element set of algebraically independent transcendental complex numbers and \( K_0 = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2g+1}) \) 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
\[ C : y^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i) \]
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 \( a, b \in J(K_0) \) be points of finite order such that the order of \( a \) is a power of 2 and the order of \( b \) is odd. Then there exist \( \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in \text{Gal}(K_0) \) such that
\[ \sigma_1(a) = (2n_1 + 1)a, \sigma_1(b) = 2^{m_1}b; \sigma_2(a) = (2n_2 + 1)a, \sigma_2(b) = 2^{m_2}b. \]

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 \( a \in J(\mathbb{C}) \) that lies on \( \Theta_{[g/2]} \) and has order that is a power of 2 actually has order 1 or 2.

(ii) If \( b \in J(\mathbb{C}) \) is a torsion point of odd order that lies on \( \Theta_{[2g/3]} \) then \( b = 0 \in J(\mathbb{C}) \).

(iii) Let \( g \geq 3 \). Then any torsion point \( c \in J(\mathbb{C}) \) 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 \( C = \Theta_1 \) 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 \( r = \{r_1, \ldots, r_n\} \) is a sequence of \( n \) elements \( r_i \in K \) then we write
\[ s_i(r) = s_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n) \in K \]
for the \( i \)th basic symmetric function in \( r_1, \ldots, r_n \). If we put \( r_{n+1} = 0 \) then \( s_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n) = s_i(r_1, \ldots, r_n, r_{n+1}) \).
Suppose we are given a point
\[ P = (a, b) \in C(K) \subset J(K). \]
Since \( \dim(J) = g \), there are exactly \( 2^g \) points \( a \in J(K) \) such that
\[ P = 2a \in J(K). \]
Let us choose such an \( a \). Then there is exactly one effective divisor
\[ D = D(a) \] (1)
of positive degree \( m \) on \( C \) such that \( \text{supp}(D) \) does not contain \( \infty \), the divisor \( D - m(\infty) \) is reduced, and
\[ m \leq g, \quad \text{cl}(D - m(\infty)) = a. \]
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 \( W_i \). (In addition, \( D - g(\infty) \) is reduced.) Then degree \( g \) effective divisor
\[ D = D(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j) \] (2)
with \( Q_i = (c_j, d_j) \in C(K) \). Since none of \( Q_j \)'s coincides with any of \( W_i \),
\[ c_j \neq \alpha_i \ \forall i, j. \]
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 \( y - v_D(x) \),
\[ b = -v_D(a), \quad d_j = v_D(c_j) \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \ldots, g. \]
It follows from Proposition 13.2 on pp. 409–410 of [13] that
\[ \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (x - \alpha_i) - v_D(x)^2 = f(x) - v_D(x)^2 = (x - a) \prod_{j=1}^{g} (x - c_j)^2. \] (3)
In particular, \( f(x) - v_D(x)^2 \) is divisible by
\[ u_D(x) := \prod_{j=1}^{g} (x - c_j). \] (4)

**Remark 3.1.** Summing up:
\[ D = D(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j)) \quad \text{for all} \quad j = 1, \ldots, g \]
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 \( a \) 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 \( a \) (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.,
\[v_D(\alpha_i)^2 = (a - \alpha_i) \left( \prod_{j=1}^{g} (c_j - \alpha_i) \right)^2\]
for all \( i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1 \).

Since none of \( c_j - \alpha_i \) vanishes, we may define
\[r_i = r_{i,D} := \frac{v_D(\alpha_i)}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} (c_j - \alpha_i)} = (-1)^g \frac{v_D(\alpha_i)}{u_D(\alpha_i)}\]
with
\[r_i^2 = a - \alpha_i\]
for all \( i = 1, \ldots, 2g + 1 \) (6)
and
\[\alpha_i = a - r_i^2, \ c_j - \alpha_i = r_i^2 - a + c_j\]
for all \( i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1; j = 1, \ldots, g \).

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
\[\prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = \pm b,\]
because
\[b^2 = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (a - \alpha_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i^2.\]

Now we get
\[r_i = \frac{v_D(a - r_i^2)}{\prod_{j=1}^{g} (r_i^2 - a + c_j)},\]
i.e.,
\[r_i \prod_{j=1}^{g} (r_i^2 - a + c_j) - v_D(a - r_i^2) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1.\]

This means that the degree \((2g + 1)\) monic polynomial (recall that \( \deg(v_D) \leq g \))
\[h_r(t) := t \prod_{j=1}^{g} (t^2 - a + c_j) - v_D(a - t^2)\]
has \((2g + 1)\) distinct roots \( r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1} \). This means that
\[h_r(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (t - r_i).\]

Clearly, \( t \prod_{j=1}^{g} (t^2 - a + c_j) \) coincides with the odd part of \( h_r(t) \) while \(-v_D(a - t^2)\) coincides with the even part of \( h_r(t) \). In particular, if we put \( t = 0 \) then we get
\[(-1)^{2g+1} \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -v_D(a) = b,\]
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\[ \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b. \]  
\[ (9) \]

Hereafter
\[ r = r_D := (r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1}) \in K^{2g+1}. \]

Since
\[ s_i(r) = s_i(r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1}) \]
is the \( i \)th basic symmetric function in \( r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1} \),
\[ h_r(t) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} (-1)^i s_i(r) t^{2g+1-i} = \left[ t^{2g+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{2g} (-1)^i s_i(r) t^{2g+1-i} \right] + b. \]

(Since
\[ s_{2g+1}(r) = \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = -b, \]
the constant term of \( h_r(t) \) equals \( b \).) Then
\[ t \prod_{j=1}^{g} (t^2 - a + c_j) = t^{2g+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j}(r) t^{2g+1-2j}, \]
\[ -v_D(a - t^2) = \left[ -\sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j-1}(r) t^{2g-2j+2} \right] + b. \]

It follows that
\[ \prod_{j=1}^{g} (t - a + c_j) = t^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j}(r) t^{g-j}, \]
\[ v_D(a - t) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j-1}(r) t^{g-j+1} - b. \]

This implies that
\[ v_D(t) = \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j-1}(r)(a - t)^{g-j+1} \right] - b. \]
\[ (10) \]

It is also clear that if we consider the degree \( g \) monic polynomial
\[ U_r(t) := u_D(t) = \prod_{j=1}^{g} (t - c_j) \]
then
\[ U_r(t) = (-1)^g \left[ (a - t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j}(r)(a - t)^{g-j} \right]. \]
\[ (11) \]

Recall that \( \deg(v_D) \leq g \) and notice that the coefficient of \( v_D(x) \) at \( x^g \) is \((-1)^g s_1(r)\).

This implies that the polynomial
\[ V_r(t) := v_D(t) - (-1)^g s_1(r) U_r(t) = \]
\[
\sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j-1}(r)(a-t)^{g-j+1} - b - s_1(r) \left[ (a-t)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j}(r)(a-t)^{g-j} \right] = \\
\sum_{j=1}^{g} (s_{2j+1}(r) - s_1(r)s_{2j}(r))(a-t)^{g-j}
\]

has degree \( < g \), i.e.,

\[
\deg(V_r) < \deg(U_r) = g.
\]

Clearly, \( f(x) - V_r(x)^2 \) is still divisible by \( U_r(x) \), because \( u_D(x) = U_r(x) \) divides both \( f(x) - v_D(x)^2 \) and \( v_D(x) - V_r(x) \). On the other hand,

\[
d_j = v_D(c_j) = V_r(c_j)
\]

for all \( j = 1, \ldots, g \),

because \( U_r(x) \) divides \( v_D(x) - V_r(x) \) and vanishes at all \( c_j \). Actually, \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_g\} \) is the list of all roots (with multiplicities) of \( U_r(x) \). So,

\[
D = D(a) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, v_D(c_j)) = (c_j, V_r(c_j)) \quad \forall j = 1, \ldots, g.
\]

This implies (again via the beginning of Section 2) that the pair \((U_r(x), V_r(x))\) is the Mumford representation of \( c(D - g(\infty)) = a \). So, the formulas (11) and (12) give us an explicit construction of \((D(a) \text{ and } a) \) in terms of \( r = (r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1}) \) for each of \( 2^{2g} \) choices of \( a \) with \( 2a = P \in J(K) \). 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 \( a \in J(K) \) with \( 2a = P \) such that the corresponding \( r_i \) defined by (5) coincides with chosen \( \sqrt{a - \alpha_i} \) for all \( i = 1, \ldots, 2g + 1 \), and the Mumford representation \((U_r(x), V_r(x))\) for this \( a \) is given by formulas (11)-(12). This gives us the following assertion.

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

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

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

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

Let \( s_i(r) \) be the \( i \)th basic symmetric function in \( r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1} \). Let us put

\[
U_r(x) = (-1)^g \left[ (a-x)^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} s_{2j}(r)(a-x)^{g-j} \right],
\]

\[
V_r(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (s_{2j+1}(r) - s_1(r)s_{2j}(r))(a-x)^{g-j}.
\]

Then there is a natural bijection between \( \mathcal{R}_{1/2,P} \) and \( M_{1/2,P} \) such that \( r \in \mathcal{R}_{1/2,P} \) corresponds to \( a_r \in M_{1/2,P} \) with Mumford representation \((U_r, V_r)\). More explicitly, if \( \{c_1, \ldots, c_g\} \) is the list of all \( g \) roots (with multiplicities) of \( U_r(x) \) then \( r \)
corresponds to
\[ a_r = \text{cl}(D - g(\infty)) \in J(K), \quad 2a_r = P \]
where the divisor
\[ D = D(a_r) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (Q_j), \quad Q_j = (c_j, V_r(c_j)) \in C(K) \text{ for all } j = 1, \ldots, g. \]

In addition, none of \( \alpha_i \) is a root of \( U_r(x) \) (i.e., the polynomials \( U_r(x) \) and \( f(x) \) are relatively prime) and
\[ r_i = s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)} \text{ for all } i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1. \]

**Proof.** Actually we have already proven all the assertions of Theorem 3.2 except the last formula for \( r_i \). It follows from (4) and (5) that
\[ r_i = (-1)^g \frac{U_D(a_r)(\alpha_i)}{U(a_i)} = (-1)^g \frac{U_D(a_r)(\alpha_i)}{U(a_i)} \cdot \]
It follows from (12) that
\[ v_{D(a_r)}(x) = (-1)^g s_1(t) U_r(x) + V_r(x). \]
This implies that
\[ r_i = (-1)^g \frac{(-1)^g s_1(t) U_r(\alpha_i) + V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)} = s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)}. \]

\[ \square \]

**Corollary 3.3.** We keep the notation and assumptions of Theorem 3.2. Then
\[ 2g \cdot s_1(t) = (-1)^g s_1(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)}. \]

In particular, if \( \text{char}(K) \) does not divide \( g \) then
\[ s_1(t) = \frac{(-1)^{g+1}}{2g} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)}. \]

On the other hand, if \( \text{char}(K) \) divides \( g \) then
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)} = 0. \]

**Proof.** It follows from the last assertion of Theorem 3.2 that
\[ s_1(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \left( s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)} \right) = (2g + 1)s_1(t) + (-1)^g \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)}. \]
This implies that
\[ 0 = 2g \cdot s_1(t) + (-1)^g \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_r(\alpha_i)}{U_r(\alpha_i)}. \]
i.e.,

\[ 2g \cdot s_1(t) = (-1)^{g+1} \sum_{i=1}^{2g+1} \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)}. \]

\[ \square \]

**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

\[ s_1(t) = \frac{(-1)^g}{2} \times \left( \frac{\alpha_l + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right)} - \left( \frac{\alpha_i + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)} \right) \right). \]

**Proof.** We have

\[ t_i = s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)}, \]

\[ t_l = s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)}. \]

Recall that

\[ t_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \neq a - \alpha_l = t_l^2. \]

In particular,

\[ t_i \neq t_l \] and therefore \( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \neq \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)}. \]

We have

\[ \alpha_l - \alpha_i = (a - \alpha_i) - (a - \alpha_l) = t_i^2 - t_l^2 = \]

\[ \left( s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 - \left( s_1(t) + (-1)^g \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 = \]

\[ (-1)^g \cdot 2 \cdot s_1(t) \cdot \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right) + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right)^2. \]

This implies that

\[ (-1)^g \cdot 2 \cdot s_1(t) \cdot \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right) = \left( \alpha_l + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2 \right) - \left( \alpha_i + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right)^2 \right). \]

This means that

\[ s_1(t) = \frac{(-1)^g}{2} \times \left( \frac{\alpha_l + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_l)}{U_t(\alpha_l)} \right)} - \left( \frac{\alpha_i + \left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)^2}{\left( \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} - \frac{V_t(\alpha_i)}{U_t(\alpha_i)} \right)} \right) \right). \]

\[ \square \]

**Remark 3.5.** Let \( \mathbf{t} = (t_1, \ldots, t_{2g+1}) \in \mathcal{R}_{1/2, P} \) with \( P = (a, b) \). Then for all \( i = 1, \ldots, 2g, 2g + 1 \)

\[ (-t_i)^2 = t_i^2 = a - \alpha_i \]

and

\[ \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} (-t_i) = (-1)^{2g+1} \prod_{i=1}^{2g+1} t_i = -(-b) = b. \]
This means that

\[-r = (-r_1, \ldots, -r_{2g+1}) \in \mathcal{R}_{1/2,i}(P)\]

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

\[U_{-r}(x) = U_r(x), \quad V_{-r}(x) = -V_r(x)\]

and therefore \(a_{-r} = -a_r\).

**Remark 3.6.** The last assertion of Theorem 3.2 combined with Corollary 3.4 allow us to reconstruct explicitly \(r = (r_1, \ldots, r_{2g+1})\) and \(P = (a, b)\) if we are given the polynomials \(U_r(x), V_r(x)\) (and, of course, \(\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2g+1}\}\)).

**Example 3.7.** Let us take as \(P = (a, b)\) the point \(\mathfrak{M}_{2g+1} = (\alpha_{2g+1}, 0)\). Then \(b = 0\) and \(r_{2g+1} = 0\). We have \(2^{2g}\) arbitrary independent choices of (nonzero) square roots \(r_i = \sqrt{\alpha_{2g+1} - \alpha_i}\) with \(1 \leq i \leq 2g\) (and always get an element of \(\mathcal{R}_{1/2,i}(P)\)).

Now Theorem 3.2 gives us (if we put \(a = \alpha_{2g+1}, b = 0\)) all \(2^{2g}\) points \(a_r\) of order 4 in \(J(K)\) with \(2a_r = \mathfrak{M}_{2g+1}\). Namely, let \(s_i\) be the \(i\)th basic symmetric function in \((r_1, \ldots, r_{2g})\). Then the Mumford representation \((U_r, V_r)\) of \(a_r\) is given by

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

\[
V_r(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (s_{2j+1} - s_1 s_{2j}) (\alpha_{2g+1} - x)^{g-j}.
\]

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

\[r_i = \sqrt{-\alpha_i} \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \ldots, 2g,
\]

\[U_r(x) = x^g + \sum_{j=1}^{g} (-1)^j s_{2j} x^{g-j},
\]

\[V_r(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{g} (s_{2j+1} - s_1 s_{2j}) (-x)^{g-j}.
\]

**References**


Pennsylvania State University, Department of Mathematics, University Park, PA 16802, USA

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