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ABSTRACT

Divisors of Modular Parameterizations of Elliptic Curves

Jonathan Reid Hales
Department of Mathematics, BYU
Master of Science

The modularity theorem implies that for every elliptic curve $E/\mathbb{Q}$ there exist rational maps from the modular curve $X_0(N)$ to $E$, where $N$ is the conductor of $E$. These maps may be expressed in terms of pairs of modular functions $X(z)$ and $Y(z)$ that satisfy the Weierstrass equation for $E$ as well as a certain differential equation. Using these two relations, a recursive algorithm can be constructed to calculate the $q$-expansions of these parameterizations at any cusp. These functions are algebraic over $\mathbb{Q}(j(z))$ and satisfy modular polynomials where each of the coefficient functions are rational functions in $j(z)$. Using these functions, we determine the divisor of the parameterization and the preimage of rational points on $E$. We give a sufficient condition for when these preimages correspond to CM points on $X_0(N)$. We also examine a connection between the algebras generated by these functions for related elliptic curves, and describe sufficient conditions to determine congruences in the $q$-expansions of these objects.
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1.1 Introduction

The modularity theorem [3, 13] guarantees for every elliptic curve $E$ of conductor $N$ the existence of an element $f_E$ of $S_2(\Gamma_0(N), \mathbb{Z})$, the space of modular forms of weight $k$, level $N$ and Fourier coefficients in the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ (see section 1.3). The Eichler integral of $f_E$ together with the Weierstrass $\wp$-function give a rational map from the modular curve $X_0(N)$ to $E$ that parameterizes the coordinates of an integral model for the curve $E$ for each element of the endomorphism group of $E$ (see section 2.1). Kodgis [7] showed computationally that many of the zeros of modular parameterizations occur at CM points on $X_0(N)$. Peloze [9] later proved several general cases confirming many of these conjectured zeros using the theory of Hecke operators and Atkin–Lehner involutions.

In [2], the authors use the modular parametrization of an elliptic curve to give a harmonic Maass form of weight $3/2$ whose Fourier coefficients encode the vanishing of central $L$-values and $L$-derivatives of quadratic twists of the curve. The Birch and Swinerton-Dyer conjecture asserts that the order of vanishing of the central $L$-value of an elliptic curve is the rank of the curve. Kolyvagin [8] confirmed this conjecture if the order of vanishing is less than 2. Unfortunately, the result of [2] is only fully constructive if the modular parametrization is holomorphic on the upper half plane. Otherwise we must remove the singularities, a task which is difficult without knowledge of their locations.

For a modular form $F \in M_k(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$, where $\mathcal{O}$ is the ring of integers in some number field, we consider the modular polynomial of $F$

$$
\Phi_F(x) := \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus SL_2(\mathbb{Z})} \left( x - F(\gamma z) \right) = \sum A_i(z) x^i
$$

where $\gamma z$ denotes $\frac{ax+b}{cz+d}$ and $\gamma = \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ c & d \end{array} \right)$ (see section 1.3). One of our goals is to calculate
the minimal divisor of (1.1) for rational functions in a given modular parameterization $(X(z), Y(z))$ of $E$. The zeros of this divisor are the poles of $\Phi_F$, and in many cases they occur at CM points of $X_0(N)$. One way to calculate the divisor is to examine the coefficient functions $A_i(z)$ determined by symmetric polynomials in the factors $(x - F(\gamma z))$ and calculate their divisors until we have located all of the poles. In order to calculate the product in (1.1) we need the expansion of $F$ at each of the cusps of $\Gamma$. Algorithms for calculating the coefficients at the cusp infinity are described by Cremona [4], and we include a variation of that method that allows for the computation of coefficients at any cusp, making the construction of the $A_i$’s possible. Explicit code written for these computations is given in appendix A.

**Example 1.1.1.** For the elliptic curve

$$E : y^2 + y = x^3 - x^2 - 10x - 20$$  \hspace{1cm} (11a1)

one can calculate that $E$ has $(5, 5)$ and $(5, -6)$ as points of order 5. If we set $F(z) = (X(z) - 5)^{-1}$, then $F(z)$ has zeros only when $z$ is an element of the complex lattice associated to $E$, and poles only when $z$ is mapped to one of these 5-torsion points. Computing the divisor of $\Phi_F(X)$, we find that

$$X(z) = 5 \quad \implies \quad (j(z) + 24729001)(j(z) + 32768) = 0.$$  

For $z = \frac{1 + \sqrt{-11}}{2}$, $j(z) = -32768$. Since $j(z)$ is invariant under the action of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ while $F$ is only $\Gamma_0(11)$ invariant, we look at the $\Gamma_0(11) \backslash \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ orbit of $z$ to find

$$z_0 = \frac{-11 + \sqrt{-11}}{55} \quad \implies \quad (X(z_0), Y(z_0)) = (5, 5).$$

Thus the point $z_0$ is a preimage of the rational point $(5, 5)$, and is a CM point on $X_0(11)$.  

2
We give a sufficient condition for when a point $P$ lying above a rational point $P$ on $E$ is a CM point. The proof is given in chapter 2.

**Theorem 1.1.2.** Fix an elliptic curve $E/\mathbb{Q}$ of conductor $N$. Let $P$ be a point on $E$ and $P$ a point on $X_0(N)$ that maps to $P$ under some modular parameterization. The point $P$ can be identified as the pair $(e_1, c_1)$ where $e_1$ is an elliptic curve over a number field $K$ and $c_1$ a cyclic subgroup of order $N$. For each $m$ exactly dividing $N$, the Atkin-Lehner involution $W_m$ imposes an $m$-isogeny defined over $K$ or else $e_1$ has CM by an order of discriminant $D$ with $0 \leq -D \leq 4m$ and $D$ a square mod $4m$.

In chapter 3 we consider the following question. Given an elliptic curve $E$, when are the coefficients of these parametrizations contained in some prime ideal $p$ of a number ring $\mathcal{O}$? Similarly, when are the Fourier expansions of two modular parameterizations for curves $E_1$ and $E_2$ congruent mod $\mathfrak{P}$? One sufficient condition we give is that the elliptic curves are isogenous and have congruent coefficients mod $p$ for some prime $p$ lying below $p$. Another sufficient condition we provide is a bound similar to Sturm’s bound that implies that every coefficient of the parameterizations is in $p$ if the order of vanishing mod $\mathfrak{P}$ is large enough.

### 1.2 The Weierstrass $\wp$ Function

For any elliptic curve $E$ with model $y^2 = 4x^3 - g_2x - g_3$ over $\mathbb{C}$, there are two $\mathbb{R}$-linear independent complex constants $\omega_1, \omega_2$ (calculated from certain definite integrals) known as the *periods* of $E$. We denote the period lattice that $\omega_1$ and $\omega_2$ generate by $\Lambda_E$. The Weierstrass $\wp$ function is defined in terms of $\Lambda_E$ and a complex variable $z$ as follows:

$$\wp(z, \Lambda_E) := \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_E, \lambda \neq 0} \left( \frac{1}{(z + \lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right).$$
Proposition 1.1. \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)\) coversges absolutely and uniformly for \(z\) in any compact subset of \(\mathbb{C} - \Lambda_E\).

Proof. The proof follows from the following lemma.

Lemma 1.2. The series \(\sum_{\ell \in L} |\ell|^{-s}\) coversges absolutely in any lattice \(L \subseteq \mathbb{C}\) if \(s > 2\).

Proof. This holds because the number of lattice points \(\ell \in L\) satisfying \(n - 1 \leq |\ell| \leq n\) is at most a constant multiple of \(n\) (this constant depends on \(L\) but not \(n\)). Thus \(\sum_{\ell \in L} |\ell|^{-s}\) is bounded above by \(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \cdot n^{-s}\) which converges for \(s > 2\). \(\square\)

The proposition now follows because for all \(z \in \mathbb{C} - \Lambda_E\) and for \(\lambda \in \Lambda_E\)

\[
\frac{1}{(z - \lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} = \frac{2z - z^2/\lambda}{(z - \lambda)^2 \lambda}
\]

which we can compare to a constant multiple of \(|\lambda|^{-3}\) via the limit comparison test. \(\square\)

Absolute convergence gives immediately that the function \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)\) is doubly periodic with periods \(\omega_1\) and \(\omega_2\). This also implies that \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)\) is an even function since

\[
\varphi(-z, \Lambda_E) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_E, \lambda \neq 0} \left( \frac{1}{(-z + \lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_E, \lambda \neq 0} \left( \frac{1}{(z - \lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{(-\lambda)^2} \right) = \varphi(z, \Lambda_E).
\]

Proposition 1.3. Any even, meromorphic, doubly periodic function with periods \(\omega_1\) and \(\omega_2\) is a rational polynomial in \(\varphi(z, \Lambda)\) where \(\Lambda\) is the lattice generated by \(\omega_1\) and \(\omega_2\).

Proof. See a very direct proof in chapter 1 section 5 of [6]. \(\square\)

Since \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)\) is even, meromorphic, and doubly periodic, so is \((\varphi'(z, \Lambda_E))^2\). Thus by the above proposition it can be written as a rational polynomial in \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)\). Comparing the coefficients of powers of \(z\) in the Laurent series expansion of \((\varphi'(z, \Lambda_E))^2\) gives the equation

\[
\varphi'(z, \Lambda_E)^2 = 4\varphi(z, \Lambda_E)^3 - g_2\varphi(z, \Lambda_E) - g_3,
\]
where
\[ g_2 = g_2(\Lambda_E) = 60 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_E \atop \lambda \neq 0} (\lambda)^{-4} \]
and
\[ g_3 = g_3(\Lambda_3) = 140 \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_E \atop \lambda \neq 0} (\lambda)^{-6}. \]

Thus the map \( z \rightarrow (\wp(z, \Lambda_E), \wp'(z, \Lambda_E)) \) gives an isomorphism from a fundamental parallelogram of \( \Lambda_E \) to \( E \).

1.3 Introduction to Modular Forms:

Let \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) denote the group of integer matrices with determinant 1. Then \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) acts on the upper-half plane \( \mathcal{H} := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : \text{Im}(z) > 0 \} \) by \( \gamma z = \frac{az+b}{cz+d} \) where \( \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \).

Of particular interest to us is the congruence subgroup of \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) denoted by \( \Gamma_0(N) := \{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : c \equiv 0 \mod N \} \).

Note that \( \Gamma_0(1) \) is simply \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). The action of \( \Gamma_0(N) \) on \( \mathbb{Q} \cup \{ \infty \} \) gives an equivalence relation where \( p \sim q \) if there exists some \( \gamma \in \Gamma_0(N) \) such that \( \gamma p = q \). We also define \( \gamma \infty = a/c. \) The equivalence classes are called the cusps of \( \Gamma_0(N) \). By the modular curve of level \( N \) we mean \( \mathcal{H} \cup \mathbb{Q} \cup \{ \infty \} \mod \)ulo the action of the elements of \( \Gamma_0(N) \). We denote the modular curve by \( X_0(N) \).

An analytic function \( f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \) is a modular form of weight \( k \) for \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) if \( f(\gamma z) = (cz + d)^k f(z) \) for all \( \gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) and \( f \) is analytic at infinity.

A natural operation to consider on these objects is the weight \( k \) slash operator, \( f(z)|_k \gamma \)
on a complex function defined to be

\[ f(z)|_k\gamma := (cz + d)^{-k} f(\gamma z). \]

Thus a modular form of weight \( k \) is an analytic function that is invariant under the weight \( k \) slash operator. Since this operator is linear, modular forms of a given weight form a complex vector space. Given the congruence subgroup \( \Gamma_0(N) \), a modular form of weight \( k \) and level \( N \) is a function \( f \) that is analytic on \( \mathcal{H} \) such that \( f|_k\gamma \) is analytic for all \( \gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) and \( f|_k\gamma_k = f \) for all \( \gamma \in \Gamma_0(N) \). We denote the complex vector space of modular forms of weight \( k \) and level \( N \) and by \( M_k(\Gamma_0(N)) \). We also denote the subset of \( M_k(\Gamma_0(N)) \) of modular forms whose Fourier coefficients are in a subring \( \mathcal{O} \) of \( \mathbb{C} \) by \( M_k(\Gamma_0(N), \mathcal{O}) \). If \( \rho = a/c \) is a cusp of \( \Gamma_0(N) \), and \( g_{\rho} \) is a matrix in \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( g_{\rho}(\infty) = \rho \), we say that the Fourier expansion of \( f(g_{\rho}z) \) is the expansion of \( f \) at the cusp \( \rho \). In general it is quite difficult to calculate the Fourier expansion of a modular form \( f \) at \( \rho \) even if the expansion at \( \infty \) is known.

The first examples of modular forms typically given are the weight \( k \) Eisenstein series given by

\[ G_k(z) = \sum_{\substack{m,n\in\mathbb{Z} \setminus (0,0) \atop (m,n) \neq (0,0)}} \frac{1}{(mz + n)^k} \]

for \( k \geq 3 \). It is a routine check (following from Lemma 1.2) that \( G_k(\gamma z) = (cz+d)^k G_k(z) \) for all \( \gamma = \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ c & d \end{array} \right) \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \).

Modular forms often encode very interesting number theoretic properties in their Fourier coefficients.

**Example 1.3.1.** If we let \( q \) denote \( e^{2\pi iz} \), then the above functions \( G_k(z) \) satisfy

\[ G_k(z) = 2\zeta(k) + 2\frac{(2\pi i)^k}{(k-1)!} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_{k-1}(n) q^n \]
where $\zeta(k)$ is the Riemann $\zeta$-function and $\sigma_k(n)$ is the typical $\sum_{d|n} d^k$. We define $E_k(z) = G_k(z)/2\zeta(k) = 1 - 2k/B_k \sum \sigma_{k-1}(n)q^n$ where $B_k$ is the $k^{th}$ Bernoulli number.

A modular form for $\Gamma_0(N)$ that vanishes at the cusps is called a cusp form. We denote the subspace of $M_k(\Gamma_0(N))$ of cusp forms by $S_k(\Gamma_0(N))$, and the subset of forms with Fourier coefficients in $\mathcal{O}$ by $S_k(\Gamma_0(N), \mathcal{O})$. The first and most important example of a cusp form is

$$\Delta = \frac{E_4^3 - E_6^2}{1728} = q - 24q^2 + 252q^3 - 1472q^4 + 4830q^5 - 6048q^6 + \cdots.$$ 

The fact that $\Delta$ is a cusp form is immediate since the only cusp for $\Gamma_0(1)$ is at $\infty$ and $\Delta$ vanishes at that cusp because its Fourier expansion has no constant term.

### 1.4 Modular Functions

A consequence of Liouville’s theorem is that any modular form of weight zero must be a constant. Thus, in order to say something interesting about the weight zero case we must weaken one of our hypotheses.

We define a modular function to be a meromorphic function on $\mathcal{H}$ that is invariant under the weight 0 slash operator for all $\gamma \in \Gamma_0(N)$.

**Example 1.4.1.** Consider $j(z)$, the Klein $j$-function, given by

$$j(z) := \frac{E_4^3}{\Delta} = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + 21493760q^2 + 864299970q^3 + 20245856256q^4 + \cdots$$

$j(z)$ has weight 0 since both $\Delta$ and $E_4^3$ have weight 12. Notice that since $j(z)$ is not a constant, we must have that $j(z)$ has a pole, which is evident by its Fourier expansion that starts with a $q^{-1}$ term.
Clearly any rational polynomial in \( j(z) \) will also be a modular function for all of \( SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). The following proposition shows that these are all of the level 1 modular functions.

**Proposition 1.4.** If \( f \) is a modular function for \( SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \), then there exist polynomials \( P(x), Q(x) \in \mathbb{C}[x] \) so that \( f(z) = P(j(z))/Q(j(z)) \).

**Proof.** First suppose that \( f \) is analytic everywhere in \( \mathcal{H} \). In this case \( f \) is a polynomial in \( j(z) \) of degree equal to the order of the pole of \( f \) at infinity. We prove this by induction on the order of this pole. If \( f \) has no pole at infinity, we have already seen that Liouville’s theorem shows that \( f \) is constant, and thus a polynomial in \( j(z) \).

If \( f \) has a pole of order \( n \) at infinity, with Fourier coefficient \( \alpha \) of \( q^{-n} \), then \( f - \alpha j(z)^n \) has a pole of order \( n - 1 \) at infinity and so by our inductive hypothesis is a polynomial of degree \( n - 1 \) in \( j(z) \).

If \( f \) has poles in \( X_0(1) \), then since \( X_0(1) \) is compact, there are only a finite number of such poles. Since \( j(z) \) is a surjective map from \( X_0(1) \) to \( \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \) (the image of \( j(z) \) is open because of analyticity and closed because \( X_0(1) \) is compact and hence must be all of \( \mathbb{C} \cup \infty \)) we can pick complex numbers \( \tau_1, \tau_2, \ldots, \tau_n \) in \( \mathcal{H} \) so that \( Q(j(z)) = \prod_i j(z) - \tau_i \) has a zero at each of the poles of \( f \) (counted with multiplicity). Thus \( fQ(j(z)) \) has poles only at infinity and by the above case is some polynomial \( P(j(z)) \). Thus \( f = P(j(z))/Q(j(z)) \). \( \square \)

**Chapter 2. The Modular Parameterization**

**2.1 The Eichler Integral and Initial Definitions**

The modularity theorem implies that for every elliptic curve \( E/\mathbb{Q} \) there exists a weight 2 and level \( N \) cusp form \( f_E \) whose Fourier coefficients come from the number of
points on $E$ in each of the finite fields $\mathbb{F}_q$. The smallest such $N$ is the conductor of $E$.

Also associated to $E$ is the canonical differential

$$\omega = mf_E(z)dz$$

where $m$ is the Manin constant. The constant $m$ is the unique rational number (up to sign) such that $\omega$ is a smooth nowhere-vanishing 1-form on the minimal Weierstrass model of $E$. It is known that $m$ is an integer and it is conjectured (in close relation to the Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture) that $m = 1$ for the Strong Weil curve. For a more detailed discussion on the Manin constant see [1].

The Eichler integral is then defined as

$$\varepsilon(z) = 2\pi i \int_z^{i\infty} \omega = 2\pi i \int_z^{i\infty} mf_E(\tau)d\tau. \tag{2.1}$$

The function $\varepsilon(z)$ is not modular, but if $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(N)$ acts as usual on the upper-half plane, then

$$\frac{d}{dz}(\varepsilon(\gamma z) - \varepsilon(z)) = \frac{d}{dz} 2\pi i \int_{\gamma z}^{z} mf_E(\tau)d\tau$$

$$= 2\pi im(f_E(z) - (cz + d)^2 f_E(z)(cz + d)^{-2}) = 0$$

where the second to last equality follows from the fundamental theorem of calculus and the modularity of $f_E$. So $\varepsilon(z)$ is almost modular, in the sense that the difference $\varepsilon(\gamma z) - \varepsilon(z)$ depends only on $\gamma$, and not on $z$. Denote this difference by

$$C(\gamma) := \varepsilon(\gamma z) - \varepsilon(z).$$
One readily verifies that $C : \Gamma_0(N) \to m\Lambda_E$ is a group homomorphism. Eichler and Shimura [5, 10] showed that when the Manin constant is 1, then $C$ is surjective.

For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\lambda \in \text{End}(E)$, we have that $\lambda \Lambda_E \subseteq \Lambda_E$. We define

$$\varphi_\lambda(z, \Lambda_E) := \lambda^2 \varphi(\lambda z, \Lambda_E) = \varphi(z, \frac{1}{\lambda} \Lambda_E),$$

where the extra factor $\lambda^2$ normalizes $\varphi_\lambda$ to have a leading coefficient of $q^{-2}$ in its Fourier expansion. Similarly,

$$\varphi'_\lambda(z, \Lambda_E) := \lambda^3 \varphi'(\lambda z, \Lambda_E) = \varphi'(z, \frac{1}{\lambda} \Lambda_E).$$

With this notation we define

$$X_\lambda(z) = m^2 \varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E) - \frac{a_1^2 + 4a_2}{12},$$

$$Y_\lambda(z) = \frac{m^3}{2} \varphi'_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E) - \frac{a_1 m^2}{2} \varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E) + \frac{a_1^3 + 4a_1 a_2 - 12a_3}{24}$$

for $E$ given in general Weierstrass form with the convention that if the subscript $\lambda$ is omitted we take $\lambda = 1$. Note that if $E$ is given in Wierstrass short form then we have a much simpler expression for $X_\lambda(z)$ and $Y_\lambda(z)$, namely

$$X_\lambda(z) := m^2 \varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E) \quad Y_\lambda(z) := \frac{m^3}{2} \varphi'_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E).$$

By construction $X_\lambda(z), Y_\lambda(z)$ satisfy the Weierstrass equation for the elliptic curve and $X_\lambda(z)$ and $Y_\lambda(z)$ are modular over $\Gamma_0(N)$ since

$$\varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(\gamma z), \Lambda_E) = \varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(z) + C(\gamma), \Lambda_E) = \varphi_\lambda(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_E)$$
where the final equality holds because \( \lambda C(\gamma) \in \Lambda_E \). A similar calculation holds for \( Y_\lambda(z) \) as well as the parametrizations for the general form.

### 2.2 Expansions at Other Cusps

The first step in computing the coefficient functions \( A_i \) in (1.1) is to compute the \( q \)-expansions of each of the factors \((x - F(\gamma z))\) for \( x \) a formal variable and \( \gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). Since we are interested specifically in \( F \) that are rational functions of \( X_\lambda(z) \) and \( Y_\lambda(z) \) it suffices to calculate the \( q \)-expansions for \( X(\gamma z) \) and \( Y(\gamma z) \). These coefficients are determined by two relations,

\[
qX' = (2Y + a_1X + a_3)f_E
\]

known as the invariant differential of \( E \) (see section III of [11]), and the rational model for the elliptic curve

\[
Y^2 + a_1XY + a_3Y = X^3 + a_2X^2 + a_4X + a_6.
\]

A recursive algorithm was given by Cremona [4] using these two relations to calculate the expansions of \( X(z) \) and \( Y(z) \) at the cusp \( \infty \). Acting on (2.2) and (2.3) by a matrix \( \gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) gives relations that allow us to recursively calculate the coefficients of modular parametrizations around cusps other than infinity. There are, however, a few complications we examine below.

If we let \( q_N(z) = e^{2\pi i z} \), we can write the expansions of the modular parametrizations at a cusp \( \rho \) with width \( w \) as \( X_\lambda(\gamma z) = \sum_{n=-2}^{\infty} b_n q_w^n \) and \( Y_\lambda(\gamma z) = \sum_{n=-3}^{\infty} d_n q_w^n \). Note that \( b_i, d_i \) might be zero for \( i = -3, -2, -1 \) if neither \( X \) nor \( Y \) have poles at \( \rho \). By examining the first few terms if the Laurent series of \( \wp_\lambda \) and \( \wp'_\lambda \) and evaluating them at \( \varepsilon(\gamma z) \) we can calculate \( b_{-2} \) and \( d_{-3} \). So our inductive set up will be to assume that we know the
\(b_i\) coefficients for \(-2 \leq i \leq n-1\) and the \(d_j\) coefficients for \(-3 \leq j \leq n-2\) and use this information to calculate \(b_n\) and \(d_{n-1}\). Letting \(c_n\) denote the coefficient of \(q^n\) of \(f_E(\gamma z)\), relation (2.2) gives us that

\[
\frac{1}{w} \sum_{n=-2}^{\infty} nb_n q^n_w = \left( 2 \sum_{n=-3}^{\infty} \sum_{n=-2}^{\infty} b_n q^n_w + a_1 \sum_{n=-2}^{\infty} b_n q^n_w + a_3 \right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n q^n_w.
\]

Comparing the coefficients of \(q^n\) gives us the linear relation between \(b_n\) and \(d_{n-1}\)

\[
 nb_n = 2w \sum_{k=-3}^{n-1} c_{n-k} d_k + a_1 w \sum_{k=-2}^{n-1} c_{n-k} b_k + a_3 wc_n. \tag{2.4}
\]

Comparing the \(q^{n-4}\) term in (2.3) gives us

\[
\sum_{k=-3}^{n-4-k} d_{n-4-k} d_k + a_1 \sum_{k=-3}^{n-2-k} b_{n-4-k} d_k + a_3 d_{n-4} =
\sum_{k=-2}^{n} \sum_{j=-2}^{n-2-k} b_{n-4-k-j} b_j b_k + a_2 \sum_{k=-2}^{n-2} b_{n-4-k} b_k + a_4 b_{n-4} + a_6^* \tag{2.5}
\]

where \(a_6^*\) indicates that this term is present only if \(n-4 = 0\). This gives a second linear relation between \(d_{n-1}\) and \(b_n\), which allows us to solve for \(d_{n-1}\) and \(b_n\) uniquely whenever the determinant of the system is not 0, i.e. when \(-2nd_{-3}^2 + 6wc_1b_{-2}^2 \neq 0\). Supposing that \(X_\lambda(z)\) has a pole at \(\rho\), (so that neither \(d_{-3}\) nor \(b_{-2}\) are 0), then

\[
-2n(d_{-3})^2 + 6wc_1(b_{-2})^2 = 0 \implies n = \frac{3wc_1(b_{-2})^2}{(d_{-3})^2}.
\]

So this recursive process will not fail if we can find the first \(\frac{3wc_1(b_{-2})^2}{(d_{-3})^2}\) nontrivial terms of \(X(z)\) and \(Y(z)\) via the Laurent series expansions of \(\wp_\lambda\) and \(\wp'_\lambda\). Note that when \(\rho = \infty\), we have that \(w = c_1 = b_{-2} = d_{-3} = 1\) so that Cremona’s algorithm doesn’t fail with as few as 3 known terms of the Laurent expansion of \(\wp_\lambda(\varepsilon(z))\).

However, if there are no poles at \(\rho\), then \(d_i = b_j = 0\) for \(i, j < 0\), and the determinant
will be 0 for all $n$. So when calculating the $q_w$-expansions around cusps without poles, we need to compare other powers of $q_w$ to get information about such systems. Comparing powers of $q_w^n$ in both (2.2) and (2.3) gives

$$nb_n = 2w \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_{n-k}d_k + a_1w \sum_{k=0}^{n} c_{n-k}b_k + a_3wc_n.$$  

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} d_{n-k}d_k + a_1 \sum_{k=0}^{n} b_{n-k}d_k + a_3d_n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-k} b_{n-k-j}b_jd_k + a_2 \sum_{k=0}^{n} b_{n-k}b_k + a_4b_n + a_6^*.$$  

This gives two new linear relations between $d_n$ and $b_n$ whose determinant is $n(2d_0 + a_1b_0 + a_3)$. Interestingly, this determinant is zero when $2d_0 + a_1b_0 + a_3 = 0$, i.e. when the constant terms of the expansions of $X(z)$ and $Y(z)$ give a point of order 2 on $E$. This is seen most easily by looking at (2.2), and observing that $2d_0 + a_1b_0 + a_3 = 0$ corresponds to a vertical tangent line on $E$.

Thus the final case we consider is when $2d_0 + a_1b_0 + a_3 = 0$. In this case, we compare powers of $q_w^n$ in (2.2) and powers of $q_w^n$ in (2.3) exactly like the previous case. The main difference is that since $2d_0 + a_1b_0 + a_3 = 0$, this gives us a system in the unknowns $b_n$ and $d_{n-1}$ instead of in terms of $b_n$ and $d_n$. Specifically, we get the linear equations

$$nb_n - 2wd_{n-1} = 2w \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} c_{n-k}d_k + a_1w \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} c_{n-k}b_k$$  

$$(2d_1)d_{n-1} - (3b_0^2 + 2a_2b_0 + a_4 - a_1d_0)b_n = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} b_{n-k-j}b_jb_k + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} b_{n-1-j}b_jb_1$$

$$+ a_2 \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} b_{n-k}b_k - \left( \sum_{k=2}^{n-2} d_{n-k}d_k + a_1 \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} d_{n-k}b_k \right).$$

Thus, we calculate that this system is always uniquely solvable for $b_n$ and $d_{n-1}$ unless
\(2n d_1 - 2w(3b_0^2 + 2a_2b_0 + a_4 - a_1d_0) = 0\). This would imply that
\[
n = \frac{2w(3b_0^2 + 2a_2b_0 + a_4 - a_1d_0)}{d_1}.
\]

Note that \(d_1 \neq 0\) since \(d_1 = 0\) would give \(b_1 = b_2 = 0\), and in order to satisfy equations (2.4) and (2.5) \(X(z)\) and \(Y(z)\) would need to be \(b_0\) and \(d_0\), a contradiction. So this recursive process will not fail if we can find the first \(2w(3b_0^2 + 2a_2b_0 + a_4 - a_1d_0)/d_1\) nontrivial terms of \(X(z)\) and \(Y(z)\) via the Laurent series expansions of \(\wp_\lambda\) and \(\wp'_\lambda\).

Thus, given any elliptic curve \(E\), we can calculate \(X(\gamma z), Y(\gamma z)\) for any \(\gamma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\) by considering one of the three cases, \(X(z), Y(z)\) has a singularity at \(\gamma \infty\), \(X(z), Y(z)\) is analytic at \(\gamma \infty\) and \((X(\gamma \infty), Y(\gamma \infty))\) is not a point of order 2 on \(E\), and finally the case where \(X(z), Y(z)\) is analytic at \(\gamma \infty\) and \((X(\gamma \infty), Y(\gamma \infty))\) is a point of order 2 on \(E\).

### 2.3 The Modular Polynomial

Now that we can efficiently calculate the \(q\)-expansions for \(X(\gamma z), Y(\gamma z)\) it is possible to construct
\[
\Phi_F(x) := \prod_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0(N) \setminus \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} (x - F(\gamma z)) = \sum A_i(z)x^i
\]
where \(x\) is a formal variable and \(F\) is any rational function in \(X_\lambda(z)\) and \(Y_\lambda(z)\). Note that by construction, the coefficients of \(\Phi_F(x)\) are modular functions which are invariant under the action of \(\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})\), and so are rational functions in Klein’s \(j\)-function.

In practice, in order to compute the minimal divisor of \(\Phi_F(x)\) it is computationally advantageous to compute each of the functions \(F(\gamma z)\) and then use symmetric polynomials to calculate the necessary coefficient functions until we locate all the poles of \(F\).
Example 2.3.1. Consider the elliptic curve

$$E : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 - x^2 - 3x + 3. \quad (26b1)$$

The point $(1, 0)$ lies on $E$ and has $(1, -2)$ as its inverse. Then looking at the function $F(z) = \frac{Y(z) + 2}{X(z) - 1}$, we see that $F$ has a simple pole $z \in \mathcal{H}$ that map $(X(z), Y(z))$ to $(1, 0)$. Note that the conductor of $E$ is 26, and $[\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma_0(26)] = 42$. Calculating the trace of $\Phi_F$ (or the coefficient $A_{41}(z)$) we get

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_0(26) \setminus \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} F(\gamma z) = \frac{-j(z)^2 + 54688j(z) - 37627200}{j(z) - 54000}.$$ 

Testing the 42 cosets of $\Gamma_0(26)$ in $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ gives us that for $z_0 = \frac{-7 + \sqrt{-3}}{62}$, $(X(z_0), Y(z_0)) = (1, 0)$. Thus a preimage of the rational point $(1, 0)$ is a CM point on $X_0(26)$.

Using this theory we are able to give a condition for when a point $P$ on an elliptic curve $E$ is the image of a CM point $\mathcal{P}$ on the modular curve and prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2 Suppose that $m$ exactly divides $N$ and let $\mathcal{P}_2 = (e_2, c_2)$ be the image of $\mathcal{P}_1 = (e_1, c_1)$ under the Atkin-Lehner involution $W_m = (\frac{am}{cN}, \frac{b}{dm})$ for integers $a, b, c, d$. The matrix $W_m$ imposes a rational map from $X_0(N)$ to itself, so if $e_1$ is not isomorphic to $e_2$, then $W_m$ is a rational isogeny of the curves $e_1$ and $e_2$. If $e_1$ is isomorphic to $e_2$ and we write the periods for $e_1$, $e_2$ as $\omega_{11}, \omega_{12}$ and $\omega_{21}, \omega_{22}$ respectively, then $W_m$ takes $\tau_1 = \frac{\omega_{11}}{\omega_{11}}$ to $\tau_2 = \frac{\omega_{21}}{\omega_{21}}$. However, since $e_1 \cong e_2$, there must be a matrix $A = (\frac{\alpha}{\gamma}, \frac{\beta}{\delta})$ in $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $W_m \tau_1 = \tau_2 = A \tau_1$. This gives a quadratic relation that $\tau_1$ satisfies, namely

$$(am \tau_1 + b)(\gamma \tau_1 + \delta) = (\alpha \tau_1 + \beta)(cN \tau_1 + dm).$$
Expanding and collecting like terms gives

\[(am\gamma - c\alpha N)\tau_1^2 + (b\gamma + am\delta - cN\beta - d\alpha\beta)\tau_1 + b\delta - dm\beta = 0.\]

The discriminant of this quadratic is

\[D = (b\gamma + am\delta - cN\beta - d\alpha\beta)^2 - 4(am\gamma - c\alpha N)(b\delta - dm\beta)\]

\[= b^2\gamma^2 + a^2m^2\delta^2 + c^2N^2\beta^2 + d^2m^2\alpha^2\]

\[+ 2b\gamma am\delta - 2b\gamma cN\beta - 2b\gamma d\alpha\beta - 2am\delta cN\beta - 2adm^2\alpha\delta + 2cN\beta d\alpha\]

\[- 4(am\gamma b\delta - am^2 d\beta\gamma - cNba\delta + c\alpha Ndm\beta).\]

We collect like terms and use the fact that \(\det(W_m) = adm^2 - cNb = m\) to get

\[D = b^2\gamma^2 + a^2m^2\delta^2 + c^2N^2\beta^2 + d^2m^2\alpha^2\]

\[- 2b\gamma am\delta + 2b\gamma cN\beta - 2b\gamma d\alpha\beta - 2am\delta cN\beta + 2adm^2\alpha\delta - 2cN\beta d\alpha\]

\[- 4(m\alpha\delta - m\beta\gamma).\]

Factoring and using that \(\det(A) = \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = 1\) gives that

\[D = (b\gamma - am\delta + cN\beta - d\alpha\beta)^2 - 4m.\]

Thus \(D\) is a square mod \(4m\). Since \(\tau_1\) is in the upper half plane, we must have that \(D < 0\). However, since \((b\gamma - am\delta + cN\beta - d\alpha\beta)^2\) is non-negative, we have \(-4m \leq D < 0.\)

\[\square\]

**Example 2.3.2.** We return to the curve

\[E : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 - x^2 - 3x + 3\]  \hspace{1cm} (26b1)
of conductor 26 and index 42. Consider the points $(1, -2)$ and $(3, 2)$ with inverses $(1, 0)$ and $(3, -6)$ on $E$. Then the functions $F$ and $G$ given by

$$F(z) = \frac{Y(z) - 0}{X(z) - 1}, \quad G(z) = \frac{Y(z) + 6}{X(z) - 3}$$

have simple poles for $z$ such that $(X(z), Y(z)) = (1, -2)$ or $(3, 2)$ respectively. We calculate specific coefficient functions of $\Phi_F = \sum A_i(z)x^i$ and $\Phi_G = \sum B_i(z)x^i$ to determine the location of these poles in the upper half plane:

$$A_{41}(z) = \frac{-j(z)^2 + 288156 \cdot j(z) - 199626768}{j(z) - 287496},$$
$$B_{40}(z) = \frac{j(z)^3 - 3214 \cdot j(z)^2 + 2726620 \cdot j - 274323456}{j(z) - 1728}.$$

Thus $\Phi_F(z)$ has poles only when $j(z) = 287496$, i.e. when $z$ is in the $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ orbit of $\sqrt{-4}$, and $G(z)$ has poles only when $j(z) = 1728$ i.e. when $z$ is in the $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ orbit of $\sqrt{-1}$.

Comparing the actions of the coset representatives of $\Gamma_0(26)$, we find that $z_0 := \frac{-5 + \sqrt{-1}}{52}$ satisfies $(X(z), Y(z)) = (1, -2)$, and $z_1 = \frac{5 + \sqrt{-1}}{13}$ satisfies $(X(z), Y(z)) = (3, 2)$.

Examining the action of the Atkin-Lehner involutions $W_2$ and $W_{13}$, we find that $F_2 = F(W_2z)$, and $G_2 = G(W_2z)$ have coefficient functions

$$A_{40}(z) = \frac{-j(z)^2 + 3235 \cdot j(z) - 2655936}{j(z) - 1728}, \quad B_{41}(z) = \frac{-42 \cdot j(z) + 21954240}{j(z) - 287496},$$
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while \( F_{13} := F(W_{13}z) \) and \( G_{13} := G(W_{13}z) \) have coefficient functions

\[
A_{41}(z) = \frac{-j(z)^2 + 288156 \cdot j(z) - 199626768}{j(z) - 287496},
\]
\[
B_{40}(z) = \frac{j(z)^3 - 3214 \cdot j(z)^2 + 2726620 \cdot j - 274323456}{j(z) - 1728}.
\]

Thus since \( W_2 \) exchanges the poles of \( F \) and \( G \), Theorem 1.2 gives that the points \( z_0, z_1 \) correspond to isogenous elliptic curves on \( X_0(26) \). Additionally, since \( W_{13} \) fixes \( z_0 \) and \( z_1 \), Theorem 1.2 also tells us they are both CM points on \( X_0(26) \) whose orders have discriminants that must be squares mod 52. In fact, the minimal polynomial of \( z_0 \) is \( 104z^2 - 20z + 1 \) which has discriminant \(-16 \equiv 6^2 \mod 52 \), and the minimal polynomial for \( z_1 \) is \( 13z^2 - 10z + 2 \) which has discriminant \(-4 \equiv 10^2 \mod 52 \).

The previous example describes a process that is quite general. Given a curve \( E \), with a rational point \((x, y)\) and modular parameterization \( X(z), Y(z) \), then the function \( F(z) = (Y(z) - y^*) / (X(z) - x^*) \) where \((x^*, y^*)\) is the inverse of the point \((x, y)\) as a point on \( E \) has a pole of order 1 at any complex number \( w \in \Lambda_E \) such that \((X(w), Y(w)) = (x, y)\). This is because \( Y(z) - y^* \) and \( X(z) - x^* \) have poles of order 3 and 2 respectively at such a point \( w \). Using the algorithm described in section 2.2, we calculate \( F(\gamma z) \) for coset representitives of \( \Gamma_0(N) \backslash \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). This allows us to use symmetric polynomials to calculate the coefficients \( A_i(z) \) of \( \Phi_F(z) \) whose poles are precisely the complex numbers \( w \) we desire. This process was previously known, but was limited to the cases where \( N \) was a prime so that the functions \( F(\gamma z) \) could be feasibly computed.

**Example 2.3.3.** Theorem 1.2 can also be visualized in the following way. Consider again the elliptic curve \( E : y^2 + y = x^3 - x^2 - 10x - 20 \) of conductor 11, and the fundamental domain \( F_{11} \) in figure 2.1 for the congruence subgroup \( \Gamma_0(11) \).
This fundamental domain has been constructed by taking $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ coset representatives of the form $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & j \end{pmatrix}$ for $-5 \leq j \leq 5$, with each $j$ labeled in the corresponding hypertriangle. The associated newform of $E$ is $f_E = q - 2q^2 - q^3 + 2q^4 \ldots$. Taking complex values $z$ on the boundary of $F_{11}$ and calculating $\varepsilon(z) = \int_z^{i\infty} m f_E(\tau) d\tau$ gives the image in Figure 2.2. The resulting image tiles the plane in a parallelogram-type pattern, with the same periods as $E$. The points $A, B$ and $C$ have been labeled at $2/5$, $3/5$ and $4/5$ times the real period of $E$ respectively. They correspond to the points $(5, -6), (5, 5)$ and $(16, 60)$ on $E$ respectively. The action of $W_{11}$ interchanges the two cusps in Figure 2 (\(\infty\) located at the origin, and 0 located at the value \(0.2538\ldots\) on the real line which is $1/5$ the real period of $E$). Up to translation by the real period, we see that $W_{11}$ interchanges the points $A$ and $C$ but fixes point $B$. By Theorem 1.2 we conclude that the preimages of the points $(5, -6)$ and $(16, 60)$ on $X_0(11)$ give isogenous elliptic curves, while the preimage of $(5, 5)$ on $X_0(11)$ must be a CM point as we saw in Example 1.1.
Chapter 3. Congruences Between Modular Parametrizations

3.1 Motivating Examples

Consider the elliptic curves $E_1$, $E_2$ given by

$$E_1 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 + 4x - 6,$$  \hspace{1cm} (14a1) \\
$$E_2 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 - 36x - 70.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14a2) \\

Looking at the $q$-expansions of the row reduced basis elements of $\mathbb{Q}[X(z), Y(z)]$, we see

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis over $E_1$, $X = X_{E_1}(z)$, $Y = Y_{E_1}(z)$</th>
<th>$q$-expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z) - 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-2} + q^{-1} + 2q + 2q^2 + 3q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-Y(z) - 2X(z) - 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-3} + 2q^{-1} + 5q + 4q^2 + 2q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z)^2 + 2Y(z) - X(z) + 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-4} - q^{-1} - 2q + 8q^2 + 5q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-Y(z)X(z) - 3X(z)^2 + 2Y(z) + 3X(z) - 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-5} - 2q - 4q^2 + 18q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z)^3 + 3X(z)Y(z) - 5Y(z) + 2X(z) - 6$</td>
<td>$q^{-6} - 2q^{-1} + 4q - 7q^2 - 6q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis over $E_2$, $X = X_{E_2}(z)$, $Y = Y_{E_2}(z)$</th>
<th>$q$-expansion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z) - 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-2} + q^{-1} + 2q + 10q^2 - 5q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-Y(z) - 2X(z) - 2$</td>
<td>$q^{-3} + 2q^{-1} - 3q - 4q^2 + 2q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z)^2 + 2Y(z) - X(z) - 14$</td>
<td>$q^{-4} - q^{-1} + 14q + 29q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-Y(z)X(z) - 3X(z)^2 + 2Y(z) + 3X(z) + 38$</td>
<td>$q^{-5} + 6q - 28q^2 - 14q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X(z)^3 + 3X(z)Y(z) - 5Y(z) - 22X(z) - 6$</td>
<td>$q^{-6} - 2q^{-1} - 12q + 25q^2 + 138q^3 + \cdots$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Congruences for basis of $\mathbb{Q}[X(z), Y(z)]$ for related elliptic curves.
the coefficients of the $q$-expansions are congruent mod 8 (see the above table).

The coefficients of the integral models for $E_1$ and $E_2$ are also congruent mod 8. However, the congruence in the basis elements of the algebras $\mathbb{Q}[X_{E_i}(z), Y_{E_i}(z)]$ for $i = 1, 2$ is not a simple consequence of the congruence of the equations of $E_1$ and $E_2$. For example, the curves

$$E_3 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 + x^2 - 5x + 2,$$

$$E_4 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 + x^2 + 35x - 28. \quad (15a3)$$

are congruent mod 10, but the $q$-expansions of the $X$ term of their optimal modular parametrizations are

$$X_{E_3}(z) = q^{-2} + q^{-1} + 1 + 2q + 3q^2 + q^3 + \ldots - 6q^{11} + \ldots,$$

$$X_{E_4}(z) = q^{-2} + q^{-1} + 1 + 2q - 5q^2 + 9q^3 + \ldots + 7q^{11} + \ldots. \quad (15a4)$$

Comparing the $q^2$ terms shows that any congruence between these two parametrizations must divide 8, and comparing the $q^{11}$ terms shows that any such congruence must divide 13. Thus we conclude that there are no nontrivial congruences between the parametrizations. So when do congruences in the elliptic curve equation give rise to congruences in the generated algebras?

If we assume that the two elliptic curves $E_1$ and $E_2$ given by

$$E_1 : y^2 + a_1 xy + a_3 y = x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_4 x + a_6,$$

$$E_2 : y^2 + a_1 xy + a_3 y = x^3 + a_2 x^2 + a_4 x + a_6,$$

are isogenous, then their period lattices will intersect nontrivially in a lattice $\Lambda_3$, corre-
sp ining to an elliptic curve $E_3$ with integral model

$$y^2 + \beta_1 xy + \beta_3 y = x^3 + \beta_2 x^2 + \beta_4 x + \beta_6.$$ 

Thus the difference

$$g(z) := \wp(z, \Lambda_1) - \wp(z, \Lambda_2)$$

is an even, elliptic function with period lattice $\Lambda_3$. If we let $\{r_i\}$ represent the complex numbers such that $\wp(r_i, \Lambda_3)$ is a zero of $g(z)$ in a fundamental parallelogram of $\Lambda_3$ and let $\{t_j\}$ be the values in $\Lambda_3$ such that $\wp(t_j, \Lambda_3)$ is a pole of $g(z)$ (repeated according to multiplicities) except possibly at the origin (even if the origin is a zero or pole of $g$), then the function

$$\frac{\prod_i (\wp(z, \Lambda_3) - \wp(r_i, \Lambda_3))}{\prod_j (\wp(z, \Lambda_3) - \wp(t_j, \Lambda_3))}$$

is monic, and has the same zeros and poles as $g(z)$ except possibly at 0. However, a classical argument shows that the product must have the same zero or pole as $g(z)$ at 0 as well (see [6] for example). Thus

$$g(z) = \wp(z, \Lambda_1) - \wp(z, \Lambda_2) = C \frac{\prod_i (\wp(z, \Lambda_3) - \wp(r_i, \Lambda_3))}{\prod_j (\wp(z, \Lambda_3) - \wp(t_j, \Lambda_3))}$$

for some constant $C$. Since

$$\wp(z, \Lambda_1) - \wp(z, \Lambda_2) = \frac{g_2(\Lambda_1) - g_2(\Lambda_2)}{20} z^2 + \frac{g_3(\Lambda_1) - g_3(\Lambda_2)}{28} z^4 + \ldots$$

we see that

$$C = C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{g_2(\Lambda_1) - g_2(\Lambda_2)}{20} & \text{if } g_2(\Lambda_1) \neq g_2(\Lambda_2) \\
\frac{g_3(\Lambda_1) - g_3(\Lambda_2)}{28} & \text{if } g_2(\Lambda_1) = g_2(\Lambda_2).
\end{cases}$$
3.2 A Sufficient Condition for Congruent Algebras

With this notation we have the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.1.** Suppose that $E_1, E_2$ are two isogenous elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$. Also assume that the coordinates of the torsion points of order dividing $N$ in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}$ are algebraic integers. Then there is an explicit natural number $D(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$ so that the $q$-expansion of $X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}$ is congruent to a constant mod $C(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)/D(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2)$.

**Proof.** Evaluating equation (3.1) at $\varepsilon(z)$ and adding the appropriate constant to both sides of the equality gives

$$X_{E_1}(z) - X_{E_2}(z) = \wp(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_1) + \frac{a_1^2 - 4a_2}{12} - \wp(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_2) - \frac{a_1^2 - 4a_2}{12}$$

$$= C \prod_i \frac{(\wp(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_3) - \wp(r_i, \Lambda_3))}{\wp(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_3) - \wp(t_j, \Lambda_3)} + \frac{a_1^2 - \alpha_1^2 + 4\alpha_2 - 4a_2}{12}$$

$$= C \prod_i X_{E_3} - R_i \prod_j X_{E_3} - T_j + \frac{a_1^2 - \alpha_1^2 + 4\alpha_2 - 4a_2}{12}$$

where $R_i = \wp(r_i, \Lambda_3) - \frac{\beta_i^2 - 4\beta_2}{12}$ and $T_j = \wp(t_j, \Lambda_3) - \frac{\beta_j^2 - 4\beta_2}{12}$. The final equality follows from $X_{E_3} = \wp(z, \Lambda_3) + \frac{\beta_3^2 - 4\beta_2}{12}$ so that the fraction cancels out of the $X_{E_3}$ term and the $R_i$ or $T_j$ term.

The $T_j$’s are $x$-coordinates of torsion points of order dividing $N$ because the poles of $g(z)$ occur at lattice points of either $\Lambda_1$ or $\Lambda_2$. By hypothesis, these coordinates are algebraic integers. Since the $q$-expansions of both $X_{E_1}$ and $X_{E_2}$ are both integers, we also have that each of $\wp(r_i, \Lambda_3)$ must be algebraic. So we define $D = D(\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2) = \prod_i D_i$ where $D_i$ is the minimal natural number so that $D_i R_i$ is an algebraic integer. Thus

$$X_{E_1}(z) - X_{E_2}(z) = \frac{C \prod_i D_i X_{E_3} - D_i R_i}{D \prod_j X_{E_3} - T_j}.$$
Since the formal product \((\prod_j X_{E_j} - T_j)^{-1}\) has algebraic integer coefficients, and since
\(D_i R_i\) is an algebraic integer for all \(i\), the above shows that all but the constant term of
the \(q\)-expansion of \(X_{E_1}(z) - X_{E_2}(z)\) are congruent to zero mod \(C/D\).

\[\square\]

**Example 3.2.2.** Let’s return to the curves \(E_1, E_2\) (Cremona labels 14a1 and 14a2) where
we found a congruence mod 8 between the \(q\)-expansions for their modular parametrizations.
The period lattices for \(E_1, E_2\) are given by the generators
\[
(z_{11}, z_{12}) \approx (1.981341, .990670 + 1.325491i), \quad (z_{21}, z_{22}) \approx (.990670, 1.325491i),
\]
and so we see that \(\Lambda_{E_1} \subseteq \Lambda_{E_2}\). So we can write \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_2)\) as a rational function in \(\varphi(z, \Lambda_1)\).
A quick calculation shows that in fact,
\[
\varphi(z, \Lambda_1) - \varphi(z, \Lambda_2) = \frac{8}{13/12 - \varphi(z, \Lambda_1)}.
\]
Since \(X_{E_1}(z) = \varphi(\varepsilon(z), \Lambda_1) - 1/12\), we conclude that
\[
X_{E_1}(z) - X_{E_2}(z) = \frac{8}{1 - X_{E_1}}.
\]
Since \(X_{E_1}\) has integer coefficients, this makes the congruence mod 8 between \(X_{E_1}\) and
\(X_{E_2}\) now apparent.

**Example 3.2.3.** Using Theorem 3.2.1 we can now see why the curves
\[
E_3 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 + x^2 - 5x + 2, \quad (15a3)
\]
\[
E_4 : y^2 + xy + y = x^3 + x^2 + 35x - 28., \quad (15a4)
\]
had only the trivial congruence mod 1 even though their expressions share a congruence
mod 10. These curves are isogenous and \(\Lambda_3 \subseteq \Lambda_4\), so we can write the difference \(X_{E_4} - \)
$X_{E_3}$ as a rational function in terms of $X_{E_3}$. Since $g_2(\Lambda_{E_3})/20 = 241/240$ and $g_2(\Lambda_{E_4})/20 = -1679/240$, we see that $C = (241 + 1679)/240 = 8$. Also, we compute that

$$X_{E_4} - X_{E_3} = C \frac{(X_{E_4} - \frac{3}{4})(X_{E_3} - \frac{3}{2})}{(X_{E_3} - 1)(X_{E_3})^2}.$$ 

So we see that $D = 8$ as well. Thus $C/D = 1$.

### 3.3 A STURM-LIKE BOUND FOR MEROMORPHIC MODULAR FORMS

While Theorem 3.2.1 describes many congruent algebras, it does not describe all congruences that we noticed computationally on curves of conductor less than 100. For example, the curves

\begin{align*}
E_1 : & \quad y^2 = x^3 + x^2 - 32x + 60 \quad \text{(96a3)} \\
E_2 : & \quad y^2 = x^3 + x^2 - 384x + 2772. \quad \text{(48a5)}
\end{align*}

are not isogenous over $\mathbb{Q}$, so Theorem 3.2.1 doesn’t tell us of any congruences between the two algebras. However, looking at the difference of the $q$-expansions of the modular parametrizations of the $x$ coordinates of these two curves gives

$$-68q + 780q^3 - 5020q^5 + 24140q^7 - 96712q^9 + 340500q^{11} - 1086568q^{13} + O(q^{15}).$$

We see that this form appears to be 0 mod 4. In fact, computationally we can confirm that a large number of coefficients are divisible by 4. We would like to be able to tell whether all of the coefficients are congruent to 0 mod 4 by looking at some finite number of terms in the $q$-expansion. To this end, we give a generalization of Sturm’s bound that applies to meromorphic modular forms. The argument is essentially the same, but we
give a proof for completeness. For a modular form with $q$-expansion $f = \sum a_n q^n$ we denote
\[ \text{ord}_p f := \text{ord}_\infty (f \mod p) = \min \{ n : a_n \not\in p \} \]
and observe that since $p$ is a prime ideal, $\text{ord}_p (fg) = \text{ord}_p (f) + \text{ord}_p (g)$. We also denote by $M^\text{m}(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ the collection of meromorphic modular forms of weight $k$ over $\Gamma$ with Fourier coefficients in $\mathcal{O}$. With this notation we prove the following.

**Lemma 3.3.1.** Let $p$ be a prime ideal in the ring of integers $\mathcal{O}$ of a number field $K$. Further suppose that $f \in M^\text{m}_k(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$ and $|\Gamma \backslash \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})| = m$. Finally, let $\Omega$ be the set of points on $X_0(N)$ where $f$ has poles. Then
\[ \text{ord}_p (f) + \sum_{\tau \in \Omega} \text{ord}_\tau (f) > \frac{km}{12} \]
implies that $f \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

**Proof.** We start with the case $\Gamma = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. We first note that since $f$ is meromorphic, $\text{ord}_\tau f < \infty$ for all $\tau \in \Omega$. Also, since the coefficients of $f$ are elements of $\mathcal{O}$, for each of the finite complex numbers $\tau_i \in \Omega \cap \Gamma \backslash \mathcal{H}$, we can pick relatively prime algebraic integers $\alpha_i, \beta_i$ so that $\beta_i j(z) - \alpha_i$ has a zero of order at least 1 at $\tau_i$. So
\[ g(z) := f(z) \prod_i (\beta_i j(z) - \alpha_i)^{-\text{ord}_\tau f} \]
has poles only at infinity, and is modular over $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Thus Sturm’s theorem applies giving $g(z) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ since
\[ \text{ord}_p (g) = \text{ord}_p (f) - \sum_{\tau_i \in \Omega} \text{ord}_{\tau_i} (f_i) \text{ord}_p (\beta_i j + \alpha_i) \geq \text{ord}_p (f) + \sum_{\tau_i \in \Omega} \text{ord}_{\tau_i} (f) > \frac{k}{12}. \]
The first inequality holds since $\alpha_i$ and $\beta_i$ are relatively prime algebraic integers in $\mathcal{O}$, implying that each of the terms $(\beta_i j + \alpha_i)$ has order 0 or $-1 \mod p$ corresponding to $\beta_i \in p$ or not. Thus $g \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ which implies that $f \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. This concludes the proof in the case that $\Gamma = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

If $\Gamma$ is an arbitrary congruence subgroup, we first pick $N$ so that $\Gamma(N) \subseteq \Gamma$ with $m$ coset representatives $\gamma_\ell$ for $\Gamma(N)$ and we set $L = K(\zeta_N)$. Since $f \in M^!!_k(\Gamma(N), L)$ and $\Gamma(N)$ is a normal subgroup of $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, the functions $f|_{k\gamma_\ell}$ are elements of $M^!!_k(\Gamma(N), L)$. Furthermore, the denominators of the Fourier coefficients of $f|_{k\gamma_\ell}$ are bounded because each is a finite $L$-linear combination of some integral basis of a finite dimensional subspace of $M^!!_k(\Gamma(N), L)$. Note that in general $M^!!_k(\Gamma(N), L)$ is not finite dimensional; however, if we restrict ourselves to the subspace that has poles of the same order and at the same locations as those of $f$ and $f|_{k\gamma_\ell}$, then this subspace is finite dimensional. Thus we can pick constants $A_\ell \in L^\times$ so that each of the functions $\text{ord}_\mathfrak{P}(A_\ell f|_{k\gamma_\ell}) = 0$ for some prime ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ lying over $p$. Reordering if necessary, let $\gamma_1$ be the identity matrix. The function

$$G(z) := f(z) \prod_{\ell=2}^m A_\ell f|_{k\gamma_\ell}$$

is a meromorphic modular form of weight $km$ over $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ with coefficients in $\mathcal{O}_L$. Then

$$\text{ord}_\mathfrak{P}(G) \geq \text{ord}_p(G) \geq \text{ord}_p(f) + \sum_{\tau \in \Omega} \text{ord}_\tau(f) > \frac{km}{12},$$

where the first equality follows because $\mathfrak{P} \cap \mathcal{O}_K = p$. We conclude that $G \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{P}}$ from the $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ case. Since each of the functions $A_\gamma f|_{k\gamma_\ell}$ were chosen such that $\text{ord}_\mathfrak{P}(A_\ell f|_{k\gamma_\ell}) = 0$, this gives $G \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ and so $f \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$. See theorem 9.18 in [12] to compare the above to the proof of Sturm’s theorem for elements of $M_k(\Gamma, \mathcal{O})$.

**Corollary 3.3.2.** If $X_{E_1}$ and $X_{E_2}$ are modular parametrizations for the $x$ coordinates
of elliptic curves $E_1$ and $E_2$ of conductor $N_1$ and $N_2$ with modular degrees $d_1$ and $d_2$ respectively, then if $\text{ord}_p(X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}) > 2(d_1 + d_2)$, then $X_{E_1} \equiv X_{E_2} \mod p$.

Proof: The number of poles of $X_{E_i}$ is at most $2d_i$ counting multiplicities. Thus the corollary follows immediately from Theorem 4.4 applied to the difference $X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}$ which is modular over $\Gamma_0(\text{lcm}(N_1, N_2))$ since

$$\text{ord}_p(X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}) + \sum_{\tau \in \omega} \text{ord}_\tau(X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}) > 2(d_1 + d_2) - 2(d_1 + d_2) = 0 = \frac{km}{12}. \quad \square$$

Note that this bound is independent of both $N_1$ and $N_2$ since the weight $k$ of the modular parametrizations is zero. We obtain a better estimate if we know a priori the locations of the poles of $X_{E_i}$ and if they cancel in the difference $X_{E_1} - X_{E_2}$.

Corollary 3.3.2 gives us an easy way of determining if two related parametrizations are congruent mod $p$. Returning to our earlier example with the curves

$$E_1 : y^2 = x^3 + x^2 - 32x + 60, \quad (96a3)$$
$$E_2 : y^2 = x^3 + x^2 - 384x + 2772, \quad (48a5)$$

since the modular degree of both $E_1$ and $E_2$ is 8, computing $2(8 + 8) = 32$ coefficients of the difference function and observing that they are congruent to 0 mod 4 is sufficient to prove that all of the coefficients are congruent mod 4.

**APPENDIX A. CODE FOR EXPANSIONS AT CUSPS**

The following is the code used to calculate the examples found in chapters 1-3. It is written for the CAS PARI/GP. Throughout the code, $\wp$ is usually referred to as "wp" and the derivative $\wp'$ is usually denoted as "wpp" (the extra "p" for prime).

```
MatAction(Gamma, z) =
```
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The following function takes an elliptic curve $E$ and a matrix $\gamma$ as an input, and calculates the value of the constant term of the expansion of $X_E$ and $Y_E$ at the image of infinity under the matrix Gamma.

\[
\text{get\_point}(E, \Gamma) = \{
\begin{align*}
\text{mf} & = \text{mffromell}(E)[1]; \\
\text{nf} & = \text{mffromell}(E)[2]; \\
\text{FS1} & = \text{mfsymbol}(\text{mf}, \text{nf}); \\
N & = \text{mf}[1][1]; \\
\text{if}(\Gamma[2,1]/N + \Gamma[2,2]) = 0, \\
z & = 2\pi i \text{mfsymboleval}(\text{FS1}, [\text{MatAction}(\Gamma, 1/N), oo]); \\
z & = -\text{polcoef}(z, 0);
\end{align*}
\]

\text{mfsymboleval} returns a polynomial instead of a float

\[
\text{if the cusp is } 1/N, \text{ then the constant term is zero (i.e. a pole in } \wp).
\]

\[
\text{if} (z\neq 0, \\
\text{return}([\text{ellztopoint}(E, z), z]));
\]

\[
\text{return}([0, 0]);
\}

The following uses the two recurrence relations to calculate the expansion of $X_E$ and $Y_E$ at a cusp if there is no pole there. The variable "Point" is a list $[[x, y], z]$ where $(x, y) = (\wp(z), \wp'(z))$ is a point on $E$.

\[
\text{expansion\_at\_cusp\_no\_pole}(E, \text{num\_of\_terms}, \Gamma, \text{point}) = \{
\begin{align*}
X & = \text{vector}(\text{num\_of\_terms}, 0);
\end{align*}
\]
Y = vector(num_of_terms,i,0);
//empty vectors where we will put the coefficients of the q-expansion
X[1] = point[1][1]; Y[1] = point[1][2];
mf = mffromell(E)[1];
//modular forms space of weight 2 and level N (the conductor of E)
f = mffromell(E)[2];
  // the associated newform
C = mfslashexpansion(mf,f,Gamma,num_of_terms,0,&P);
//the coefficients of f | [Gamma]_2
//P is a parameter that holds the width of the cusp
//among other things (see the pari documentation). for when the form
//the form we’re slashing isn’t as nice as the weight 2 cusp form.

w = P[2]; // the width

//The following are the coefficients for the model of E.
A1 = E.a1; A2 = E.a2; A3 = E.a3; A4 = E.a4; A6 = E.a6;

//This is the main recurrence that solves for b_n and d_n
//the coefficients X and Y at the cusp rho.
//Note that whenever I call Y[i+1] or X[i+1] that this corresponds
//to the coefficient of q^{-i} since PARI indexes starting at 1 and not 0.
for(n=1,num_of_terms-1,
RHS = w*(2*sum(i=1,n,Y[n-i+1]*C[i+1]) + A1*sum(i=1,n,X[n-i+1]*C[i+1])
    + A3*C[n+1]);
X[n+1] = RHS/n;
RHS = sum(i=0,n,sum(j=0,n-i,X[n-i-j+1]*X[i+1]*X[j+1] +
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\[
A2 \times \sum_{i=0}^{n} X[n-i+1]X[i+1] + A4X[n+1];
\]

\[
Y[n+1] = \text{RHS} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} Y[n-i+1]Y[i+1] - A1 \times \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y[n-i+1]X[i+1]/(2Y[0+1]+A1X[0+1]+A3);
\)

); \ This ends the for loop

return([X,Y]);}; \ This ends the function.

The following solves the system \( ax + by = c, dx + ey = f \) if the system is consistent.

\[
\text{solver}(a,b,c,d,e,f) = \{
\text{return}([[e*c-b*f/(a*e-b*d),(f*a-c*d)/(a*e-b*d)]]);
\}
\]

This function gives the isomorphism from the Weierstrass short form to the general
Weierstrass equation.

\[
\text{get_iso}(E) =
\{
\text{s} = -E.a1/2;
\text{r} = (s^{2} - E.a2 + s*E.a1)/3;
\text{t} = (-E.a3 - r*E.a1)/2;
\text{a2p} = E.a2 + 1/4*E.a1^{2};
\text{a4p} = E.a4 + 1/2*E.a1*E.a3;
\text{a6p} = E.a6 + 1/4*E.a3^{2};
\text{a4pp} = a4p - 1/3*a2p^{2};
\text{a6pp} = a6p + 2/27*a2p^{3} - 1/3*a2p*a4p;
\text{E_short} = \text{ellinit}([a4pp,a6pp]);
\text{u} = \text{bestappr}((E\_short.ddisc/E.ddisc)^{(1/12)});
\text{return}([u,r,s,t]);
\};
This function is the analog of the function `expansion_at_cusp_no_pole` if there is a pole at the cusp $\rho$. 
expansion_at_cusp_pole(E,num_of_terms,Gamma) =
{
\initial setup stuff
\elliptic curve coefficients
A1 = E.a1; A2 = E.a2; A3 = E.a3; A4 = E.a4; A6 = E.a6;
X = vector(num_of_terms+4,i,0);
Y = vector(num_of_terms + 3,i,0);
mf = mffromell(E)[1];
f = mffromell(E)[2];
N = mf[1][1]; \this is the conductor of the curve E
width = N/(gcd(N,Gamma[2,1]^2)); \this is the standard formula
C = mfslashexpansion(mf,nf,Gamma,num_of_terms+10,0,&P);
C = width*C;
\this next part is getting the initial seed values to start the
\iterative process
C_integrated = C;
for(i=2,#C_integrated, C_integrated[i] = C_integrated[i]/(i-1));
\the minus one is because PARI starts indexing its lists at 1 and not 0.
\That’s also why we start at i = 2, (nf is a newform)

q_expansion_E = Ser(C_integrated,q)+O(q^10);
\the O(q^10) is so that evaluating wp at this series is fast.
[X_series,Y_series] = ellwp(E,q_expansion_E,1);
\stuffing the integrated q_series into the weierstrass p function

\isomorphism to the normal form of E and not the weierstrass short form
\[ [u,r,s,t] = \text{get\_iso}(E); \]
\[ Y\text{\_series} = Y\text{\_series}/2; \]
\[ Y\text{\_series} = u^3 Y\text{\_series} + s u^2 X\text{\_series} + t; \]
\[ X\text{\_series} = u^2 X\text{\_series} + r; \]
\[ \text{for}(i=-3,5, X[i+4] = \text{polcoef}(X\text{\_series},i); \ Y[i+4] = \text{polcoef}(Y\text{\_series},i);); \]

\[ \text{// this for loop will fill the rest of X and Y via the recurrence relation.} \]
\[ \text{// We will calculate values of a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h} \]
\[ \text{// so that the solutions to ax+b = cy + d and ex+f = gy+h for} \]
\[ \text{// x and y are the } q^k X \text{ coefficient and the } q^{k-1} Y \text{ coefficient} \]

\[ \text{for}(k=5, \text{num\_of\_terms}, \]
\[ \text{// first linear relation from differential equation, } qX' = (2Y+a1X+a3)f* \]
\[ \text{[a,c] = [k,2*C[1+1]];} \]
\[ b = 0; \]
\[ d = 2*\text{sum}(i=-3,k-2,C[k-i+1]*Y[i+4]) + A1*\text{sum}(i=-3,k-1,C[k-i+1]*X[i+4]) \]
\[ + A3*C[k+1]; \]

\[ \text{// second linear relation from elliptic curve} \]
\[ Y^2 + a1XY + a3Y = X^3 + a2X^2 + a4X + A6. \]
\[ [e,g] = [3*X[-2+4]^2,2*Y[-3+4]]; \]
\[ h = \text{sum}(i=-2,k-2,Y[k-4-i+4]*Y[i+4]) + A1*\text{sum}(i=-3,k-2,X[k-4-i+4]*Y[i+4]) \]
\[ + A3*Y[k-4+4]; \]
\[ f = X[-2+4] \sum(j=-1,k-1, X[k-2-j+4] \times X[j+4]) + \]
\[ \sum(i=-1,k-1, \sum(j=-2,k-2-i, X[k-4-i-j+4] \times X[j+4] \times X[i+4])) + \]
\[ A2 \times \sum(i=-2,k-2, X[k-4-i+4] \times X[i+4]) + A4 \times X[k-4+4]; \]

\[ [\text{new}_x, \text{new}_y] = \text{solve}_2\text{system}(a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h); \]
\[ X[k+4] = \text{new}_x; \]
\[ Y[k-1+4] = \text{new}_y; \]

\[ \text{wp}\text{addition}(E, z, y, \text{indicator}) = \]
\[ \{ \]
\[ [wpz, wppz] = \text{ellwp}(E, z, 1); \]
\[ [wpy, wppy] = \text{ellwp}(E, y, 1); \]
\[ \text{lambda} = (wppz-wppy)/(wpz-wpy); \]
\[ \text{wpzy} = 1/4 * \text{lambda}^2 - wpz-wpy; \]
\[ \text{if}(\text{indicator} \neq 1, \text{return}(\text{wpzy}), \text{wppzy} = -1 * \text{lambda} * \text{wpzy} + (wpy*wppz-wpz*wppy)/(wpz-wpy); \]
\[ \text{return}([\text{wpzy}, \text{wppzy}]); \}\]

The following is the sum formula for \( \wp(z + y) \). This is mostly used when \( z \) is a complex number and \( y \) is a power series centered at the origin. If the indicator is 1 then this returns both \( \wp \) and the derivative \( \wp' \) evaluated at \( z + y \). Note that we can’t have \( z = y \) or else the formula we use is invalid.

\[ \text{wp}\text{addition}(E, z, y, \text{indicator}) = \]
\[ \{ \]
\[ [wpz, wppz] = \text{ellwp}(E, z, 1); \]
\[ [wpy, wppy] = \text{ellwp}(E, y, 1); \]
\[ \text{lambda} = (wppz-wppy)/(wpz-wpy); \]
\[ \text{wpzy} = 1/4 * \text{lambda}^2 - wpz-wpy; \]
\[ \text{if}(\text{indicator} \neq 1, \text{return}(\text{wpzy}), \text{wppzy} = -1 * \text{lambda} * \text{wpzy} + (wpy*wppz-wpz*wppy)/(wpz-wpy); \]
\[ \text{return}([\text{wpzy}, \text{wppzy}]); \}\]

This is the "point of order 2" case described in section 2.2. The only difference between this function and \text{expansion}_at\text{cusp}_no\text{pole} is that the recurrence relation is changed.
to reflect that we need to take \((2Y[1]+A1*X[1]+A3) = 0\) as a hypothesis. Here \(\text{const}\) is the preimage in \(\Lambda_E\) of the point of order 2 given as the constant terms in \(X(z)\) and \(Y(z)\). This is something that’s going to be calculated already and so it saves time to just pass this in as a variable.

\[
\text{expansion_at_cusp_order_2}(E, \text{num_of_terms}, \Gamma, \text{const}) = \\
\{
A1 = E.a1; A2 = E.a2; A3 = E.a3; A4 = E.a4; A6 = E.a6; 
X = \text{vector}(\text{num_of_terms}+1, i, 0); 
Y = \text{vector}(\text{num_of_terms}, i, 0);
\text{mf} = \text{mffromell}(E)[1]; 
\text{nf} = \text{mffromell}(E)[2]; 
C = \text{mfslashexpansion}(\text{mf}, \text{nf}, \Gamma, \text{num_of_terms}+5, 0, \&P); 
N = \text{mf}[1][1]; \ \text{\textbackslash /}\mbox{conductor of } E \\
\text{width} = N/(\text{gcd}(N, \Gamma[2,1]^2)); \ \text{\textbackslash /}\mbox{this is the standard formula} \\
C = \text{width}\times C; \ C_{\text{integrated}} = C; \ \text{for}(i=2, \ #C, \ C_{\text{integrated}}[i] \\
\quad = C_{\text{integrated}}[i]/(i-1)); \\
\text{\textbackslash /}\text{using the wp function and wp_addition formulas to get initial values} \\
\text{\textbackslash /}\text{so we can start the iteration. PARI currently doesn’t allow you to} \\
\text{\textbackslash /}\text{evaluate wp at a series expansion away from zero.} \\
[wp, wpp] = \text{wp_addition}(E, \text{Ser}(C_{\text{integrated}}, q) + O(q^{-10}), \text{const}, 1); \\
\text{\textbackslash /}\text{this changes the curve to elliptic form} \\
[u, r, s, t] = \text{get_iso}(E); \\
wpp = wpp/(2); \\
wpp = u^3*wp + s*u^2*wp + t; \ \text{\textbackslash /}\text{isomorphism formulas for general form} \\
wp = u^2*wp+r; 
\]
for (i=0, 5, X[i+1] = polcoef(wp, i); Y[i+1] = polcoef(wpp, i);)
\this will now be the recursive step that solves a 2x2 system for
\the kth coefficient of X and the k-1th coefficient of Y.
for (k=6, num_of_terms,
\differential equation relation
[a, c] = [k, 2*C[1+1]];
b = 0;
d = 2*sum(n=1, k-2, C[k-n+1]*Y[n+1]) + A1*sum(n=1, k-1, C[k-n+1]*X[n+1]);
\elliptic curve relation
e, g] = [3*X[0+1] - 2 + 2*A2*X[0+1] + A4 - A1*Y[0+1], 2*Y[1+1] + A1*X[1+1]];
h = sum(n=2, k-2, Y[k-n+1]*Y[n+1]) + A1*sum(n=1, k-2, X[k-n+1]*Y[n+1]);
f = X[0+1]*sum(m=1, k-1, X[k-m+1]*X[m+1])
\hspace{1cm} + sum(n=1, k-1, sum(m=0, k-n, X[k-m-n+1]*X[m+1]*X[n+1]))
\hspace{1cm} + A2*sum(n=1, k-1, X[k-n+1]*X[n+1]);
[new_x, new_y] = solve_2_system(a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h);
X[k+1] = new_x;
Y[k-1+1] = new_y; \end for loop
return([X, Y]);
Bibliography


