

## ERRATUM - A MODULARITY LIFTING THEOREM FOR WEIGHT TWO HILBERT MODULAR FORMS

TOBY GEE

### 1. Introduction

Unfortunately, the proof of Theorem 3.2 of [Gee06] (and thus the main Theorem stated in the introduction to the paper) is incomplete; in particular, the proof of Lemma 3.3 is incorrect. Specifically, one cannot automatically assume that the type of  $\rho_f$  is  $\tilde{\omega}_1 \oplus \tilde{\omega}_2$ ; to do so is to make a rather strong assumption about the Serre weights of  $\bar{\rho}_f$ . In addition one cannot conclude that the type determines the descent data on  $\mathcal{G}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$ , at least in the case where  $\bar{\rho}_f|_{G_{F_v}}$  is split; either  $\mathcal{G}_1$  can correspond to  $\tilde{\omega}_1$  and  $\mathcal{G}_2$  to  $\tilde{\omega}_2$ , or vice versa.

As a consequence, we are only able to obtain a slightly weaker modularity lifting theorem; the most general result we can obtain is:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $p > 2$ , let  $F$  be a totally real field, and let  $E$  be a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  with ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}$ . Let  $\rho : G_F \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O})$  be a continuous representation unramified outside of a finite set of primes, with determinant a finite order character times the  $p$ -adic cyclotomic character. Suppose that*

- (1)  $\rho$  is potentially Barsotti-Tate at each  $v|p$ .
- (2) There exists a Hilbert modular form  $f$  of parallel weight 2 over  $F$  such that  $\bar{\rho}_f \sim \bar{\rho}$ , and for each  $v|p$ , if  $\rho$  is potentially ordinary at  $v$  then so is  $\rho_f$ .
- (3)  $\bar{\rho}|_{G_{F(\zeta_p)}}$  is absolutely irreducible, and if  $p = 5$  and the projective image of  $\bar{\rho}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathrm{PGL}_2(\mathbb{F}_5)$  then  $[F(\zeta_5) : F] = 4$ .

Then  $\rho$  is modular.

*Proof.* The proof is extremely similar to that of Theorem 3.1 of [Gee06]. Hypothesis (3) has been weakened because of a corresponding weakening of (3.2.3)(3) in the final version of [Kis07]. As for (2), we need only check that after making a base change, we may assume that at each place dividing  $p$ ,  $\rho$  is potentially ordinary if and only if  $\rho_f$  is. This is easily achieved by employing Lemma 3.1.5 of [Kis07] at each place where  $\rho$  is not potentially ordinary.  $\square$

Additionally, we would like to thank Fred Diamond and Florian Herzig for independently bringing to our attention a minor error in the proof of Proposition 2.3. The points  $D^j$  constructed in the proof are not necessarily points on  $\mathcal{GR}_{V_{\mathbb{F}},0}$ . However,

---

Received by the editors July 16, 2007. Revision received on September 15, 2008.  
2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11F33.

their only use is in showing that the points  $D$  and  $D'$  lie on the same component, and this in fact follows immediately from an application of Lemma 2.4 with  $N = (N_i)$ ,

$$N_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -w_i u^{-b_i} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

### References

- [Gee06] Toby Gee, *A modularity lifting theorem for weight two Hilbert modular forms*, Math. Res. Lett. **13** (2006), no. 5-6, 805–811.
- [Kis07] Mark Kisin, *Moduli of finite flat group schemes, and modularity*, to appear in Annals of Mathematics (2007).

*E-mail address:* `tgee@math.harvard.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY