



# On the homeomorphisms of the space of geodesic laminations on a hyperbolic surface

Charalampos Charitos, Ioannis Papadoperakis, Athanase Papadopoulos

## ► To cite this version:

Charalampos Charitos, Ioannis Papadoperakis, Athanase Papadopoulos. On the homeomorphisms of the space of geodesic laminations on a hyperbolic surface. 2011. hal-00649664v1

**HAL Id: hal-00649664**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00649664v1>**

Preprint submitted on 8 Dec 2011 (v1), last revised 25 Mar 2012 (v3)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# ON THE HOMEOMORPHISMS OF THE SPACE OF GEODESIC LAMINATIONS ON A HYPERBOLIC SURFACE

C. CHARITOS, I. PAPADOPERAKIS, AND A. PAPADOPOULOS

ABSTRACT. We prove that for any orientable connected surface of finite type which is not a sphere with at most four punctures or a torus with at most two punctures, any homeomorphism of the space of geodesic laminations of this surface, equipped with the Hausdorff topology or with the Thurston topology, is induced by a homeomorphism of the surface.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification: 57M50 ; 20F65 ; 57R30.

Keywords: Geodesic lamination ; mapping class group ; hyperbolic surface ; Hausdorff topology ; Thurston topology .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper  $S = S_{g,p}$  is an orientable connected surface of finite type, of genus  $g \geq 0$  with  $p \geq 0$  punctures. We assume that  $S$  is not a sphere with at most four punctures or a torus with at most two punctures. Fixing a complete hyperbolic metric of finite area on  $S$  we consider the set  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  of geodesic laminations on  $S$  with compact support. As a set of compact subspaces of the metric space  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  is equipped with the Hausdorff metric which we denote by  $d_H$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{T}_H$  the topology induced by  $d_H$ , and we call it the Hausdorff topology. We consider on  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  a second topology  $\mathcal{T}$ , referred to as the Thurston topology (see the definition in §2 below) and which is weaker than  $\mathcal{T}_H$ . Any homeomorphism  $h : S \rightarrow S$  induces by push-forward a map  $h_* : \mathcal{GL}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{GL}(S)$  which is a homeomorphism with respect to both topologies  $\mathcal{T}_H$  and  $\mathcal{T}$ . The main result of this paper is the following:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Assume that  $f : \mathcal{GL}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{GL}(S)$  is a homeomorphism with respect to the topology  $\mathcal{T}_H$  or with respect to the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then there is a homeomorphism  $h : S \rightarrow S$  such that  $h_* = f$ .*

This shows in particular that the space  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  equipped with any of these two topologies is definitely not topologically homogeneous. Furthermore, since its homeomorphism group is countable, this space does not contain any open set which is a manifold of any positive dimension, in contrast with measured lamination space which is topologically a sphere.

In particular, the above theorem implies that for every isometry  $f$  of the metric space  $(\mathcal{GL}(S), d_H)$  there is a homeomorphism  $h : S \rightarrow S$  such that  $h_* = f$ .

The result is in the spirit of several rigidity results that were obtained by various authors in the context of mapping class group actions on different spaces, and it is close more specially to the results in [11], [8] and [9] which concern actions by homeomorphisms. We note that although the statements of these and other rigidity theorems all look alike, all of them are interesting because each proof displays new special features of the space on which the mapping class group acts, in different settings (combinatorial, topological, holomorphic, metric, etc.).

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in §4. We first prove the theorem in the case of the Thurston topology and then we deduce it for the case of the Hausdorff

topology. The proof involves the construction from the homeomorphism  $f$  of an automorphism of the complex of curves of  $S$ . The main technical point is to show that  $f$  preserves the set of finite laminations. For the passage between properties of laminations and homeomorphisms of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ , the idea is to translate inclusions  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  between geodesic laminations into set-theoretical properties between open sets of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ .

We would like to thank Ken'ichi Ohshika who read a preliminary version of this paper and corrected several mistakes.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND PRELIMINARIES

On the surface  $S$ , we fix a complete hyperbolic metric of finite area. A *geodesic lamination*  $\Lambda \subset S$  is a compact non-empty subset which is the union of disjoint simple geodesics. We say that a geodesic lamination is *maximal* if it is not a proper sublamination of any other geodesic lamination. We say that a geodesic lamination is *minimal* if it does not contain any proper sublamination. Note that this set-theoretic definition of a minimal lamination that we make here is not the same as the usual definition of a minimal laminations, where a lamination is said to be minimal if its leaves are dense in the support.

A geodesic lamination which is a finite union of geodesics is called a *finite lamination*. Otherwise, the lamination is said to be *infinite*.

The following two subsets of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  will play special roles in the sequel:

- $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$  is the subset of finite laminations of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ . An element of  $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$  is made out of a finite union of disjoint simple closed geodesics  $\{\gamma_i\}$  together with a finite number of infinite geodesics, each spiraling from each end around one geodesic in  $\{\gamma_i\}$ .
- $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$  is the set of geodesic laminations whose leaves are simple closed geodesics.

Obviously  $\mathcal{CGL}(S) \subset \mathcal{FGL}(S)$ .

For any subset  $X$  of  $S$  and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we set

$$N_\epsilon(X) = \{x \in S : \exists y \in X \text{ with } d(x, y) < \epsilon\}.$$

The following definition is classical:

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $X$  and  $X'$  be two compact subsets of  $S$ . The *Hausdorff distance* between  $X$  and  $X'$  is the quantity

$$d_H(X, X') = \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : X \subset N_\epsilon(X') \text{ and } X' \subset N_\epsilon(X)\}.$$

It is easy to see that the function  $d_H$  is a distance function on the set of compact subsets of  $S$ . Such a definition was made by F. Hausdorff for the set of compact subsets of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , and it was used by H. Busemann [1] for the set of compact sets of a general metric space.

We shall mostly use the notions  $N_\epsilon(X)$  and  $d_H(X, Y)$  for elements  $X, Y \subset S$  which are geodesic laminations on  $S$ . We denote by  $d_H$  the restriction of the Hausdorff metric to  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ .

We also use the following notation:

For any  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$  and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\Lambda) = \{\Lambda' \in \mathcal{GL}(S) : N_\epsilon(\Lambda') \supset \Lambda \text{ and } N_\epsilon(\Lambda) \supset \Lambda'\}.$$

The topology induced by  $d_H$  on the set of subsets of  $S$  as well as its restriction to  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ , which we shall denote by  $\mathcal{T}_H$ , are called the *Hausdorff topology*. For the topology  $\mathcal{T}_H$  any set  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\Lambda)$  is open. Moreover, it is easy to see that the collection of sets  $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\Lambda)$  with  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ , constitute a basis for  $\mathcal{T}_H$ .

We now equip the set  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with a second topology.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $V$  be an open subset of  $S$ . Set

$$\mathcal{U}_V = \{\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S) : \Lambda \cap V \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the topology on  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with subbasis the sets  $\mathcal{U}_V$ , where  $V$  varies over the set of open subsets of  $S$ .

Following the terminology of ([2], Def. I.4.1.10), we call the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  on  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  the *Thurston topology*. The original reference for the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  is (Thurston [12], Section 8.10), where  $\mathcal{T}$  is referred to as the *geometric topology*. Clearly the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  does not satisfy the first axiom of separation. Indeed, take a geodesic lamination  $\Lambda$  that contains a strict sublamination  $\Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_2$ ; then every open set for  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $\Lambda_1$  contains  $\Lambda$ . In particular the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  is not Hausdorff, unlike the topology  $\mathcal{T}_H$ , which is induced by a metric.

**Lemma 2.3.**  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{T}_H$  i.e. the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  is weaker than the topology  $\mathcal{T}_H$ .

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that for each open subset  $V$  of  $S$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_V \in \mathcal{T}_H$ . For  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{U}_V$ , we have  $\Lambda \cap V \neq \emptyset$ . For any  $x \in \Lambda \cap V$ , there exists an open ball  $B(x, \varepsilon_\Lambda)$  in  $S$  of center  $x$  and radius  $\varepsilon_\Lambda$  such that  $B(x, \varepsilon_\Lambda) \subset V$ . We now prove the following:

$$\Lambda \in \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{U}_V. \quad (*)$$

First, it is obvious that  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda)$ . To prove the inclusion  $\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{U}_V$  we note that if  $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda)$  then  $\Lambda \subset N_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda')$  and hence  $x \in N_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda')$ . Therefore we can find a point  $y$  in  $\Lambda'$  such that  $d(x, y) < \varepsilon_\Lambda$  and hence  $y \in \Lambda' \cap B(x, \varepsilon_\Lambda) \neq \emptyset$ . Since  $B(x, \varepsilon_\Lambda) \subset V$ , this implies that  $\Lambda' \cap V \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{U}_V$  and the inclusion  $\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda) \subset \mathcal{U}_V$  is proven.

Now from  $(*)$  we deduce immediately that

$$\mathcal{U}_V = \cup \{\mathcal{V}_{\varepsilon_\Lambda}(\Lambda) : \Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S) \text{ and } \Lambda \cap V \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Therefore  $\mathcal{U}_V \in \mathcal{T}_H$ . □

The metric space  $(\mathcal{GL}(S), d_H)$  is compact. This is a general result on the Hausdorff metric on the set  $\mathcal{B}(X)$  of compact subsets of a metric space  $X$ , and  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  is a closed subset of  $\mathcal{B}(S)$  (cf. [3], Theorem 3.4 for this special case). Therefore  $\mathcal{T}_H$  is a compact topology. Since  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{T}_H$ , it follows that  $\mathcal{T}$  is also a compact topology.

We now prove some fundamental properties for the topology  $\mathcal{T}$  that will be useful for us. For compactness arguments, we shall use nets instead of sequences since we deal with topological sets which are not Hausdorff (see e.g. Willard [13]).

**Lemma 2.4.** For each two points  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2$  in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ , at least one of them, say  $\Lambda_1$ , can be separated from the other in the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ , i.e. there exists  $\mathcal{U} \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $\Lambda_1 \in \mathcal{U}$  and  $\Lambda_2 \notin \mathcal{U}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\Lambda_1 \neq \Lambda_2$ , we may assume without loss of generality that there exists a leaf  $\lambda$  of  $\Lambda_1$  which is not a leaf of  $\Lambda_2$ . Pick a point  $x$  on  $\lambda$ . Then  $x \notin \Lambda_2$ . Since  $\Lambda_2$  is compact in  $S$ , we have  $d(x, \Lambda_2) > 0$  (distance to the closest point, measured in the hyperbolic metric on  $S$ ). Therefore, there exists an open ball  $B(x, \epsilon) = \{y \in S : d(x, y) < \epsilon\}$  in  $S$  such that  $B(x, \epsilon) \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$ . Thus  $\mathcal{U}_{B(x, \epsilon)}$  contains  $\Lambda_1$  but it does not contain  $\Lambda_2$ . □

From Lemma 2.4 we deduce the following:

**Corollary 2.5.** If  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$  are distinct elements of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ , then there is no net in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  which converges to both  $\Lambda_1$  and  $\Lambda_2$ .

Recall also that  $x$  is a cluster point of a net  $(x_i)_{i \in I}$  in a topological space  $X$  if for each neighborhood  $U$  of  $x$  and for every  $i_0 \in I$  there exists some  $i \geq i_0$  such that  $x_i \in U$ .

Now we prove the following

**Proposition 2.6.** *Every compact subset  $K$  of the topological space  $(\mathcal{GL}(S), \mathcal{T})$  is closed.*

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda \in \overline{K}$ . Then there exists a net  $(\Lambda_i)$  in  $K$  with  $\Lambda_i \rightarrow \Lambda$  in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ . Since  $K$  is compact, from Theorem 17.4 of [13],  $(\Lambda_i)$  has a cluster point  $\Lambda'$  in  $K$ . Now a net  $(\Lambda_i)$  in  $X$  has  $\Lambda'$  as a cluster point if and only if it has a subnet which converges to  $\Lambda'$  (cf. [13], Theorem 11.5). Thus, there is a subnet of  $(\Lambda_i)$  which converges to  $\Lambda'$ . Since this subnet also converges to  $\Lambda$  and since limits in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  are unique, as follows from Corollary 2.5, we obtain  $\Lambda = \Lambda'$ . Thus,  $\Lambda \in K$ , which shows that  $K$  is compact.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $f : \mathcal{GL}(S) \rightarrow \mathcal{GL}(S)$  be a bijection and assume that  $f$  is a homeomorphism with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$ . Then  $f$  is a homeomorphism with respect to  $\mathcal{T}$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that, with respect to the topology  $\mathcal{T}$ ,  $f$  sends closed subsets to closed subsets. Let  $K$  be a closed subset of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then the complement  $K^c$  of  $K$  is open with respect to  $\mathcal{T}$ . Since  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{T}_H$ ,  $K^c$  is open with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$  and hence  $K$  is closed with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$ . Since  $\mathcal{T}_H$  is a compact topology it follows that  $K$  is compact with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$ . On the other hand, since  $f$  is a homeomorphism with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$ ,  $f(K)$  is compact with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$ . Finally, since  $f(K)$  is compact with respect to  $\mathcal{T}_H$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{T}_H$ , we deduce that  $f(K)$  is compact and hence closed with respect to  $\mathcal{T}$  (Proposition 2.6).  $\square$

In the next theorem we summarize basic properties of minimal geodesic laminations and we also give a description of the structure of maximal geodesic laminations. The properties are all well known from Thurston's theory, and we give references for the convenience of the reader.

**Theorem 2.8.** (I) (Proposition A.2.1, p.142 in [10]) *Let  $\Lambda$  be an arbitrary geodesic lamination of  $S$ . Then  $S - \Lambda$  consists of finitely many components. Let  $U$  be such a component. The completion  $C(U)$  of  $U$  with respect to the metric induced by the Riemannian metric of  $S$  is a complete hyperbolic surface of finite area with geodesic boundary.*

(II) (Corollary A.2.4, p. 143 in [10] or Lemmata 4.2 and 4.3 in [3]) *Let  $\Lambda$  be a minimal geodesic lamination with infinitely many leaves. Then every leaf of  $\Lambda$  is dense in  $\Lambda$ . Furthermore,  $\Lambda$  contains a finite number of leaves which are isolated from one side. These leaves appear as boundary geodesics of some  $C(U)$ , where  $U$  is a component of  $S - \Lambda$ ; they will be referred to as boundary leaves of  $\Lambda$ .*

(III) Theorem I.4.2.8, p. 83 in [2]) *Let  $\Lambda$  be an arbitrary geodesic lamination of  $S$ . Then  $\Lambda$  consists of the disjoint union of a finite number of minimal sublaminations of  $\Lambda$  together with a finite set of additional geodesics each end of which "spirals" onto a minimal lamination. Each of the additional geodesics is isolated, i.e. it is contained in an open subset of  $S$  which is disjoint from the rest of the lamination.*

In Item (III) above, the fact that an end of a geodesic spirals on a minimal sublamination  $\Lambda'$  of  $\Lambda$  means that the set of accumulation points of this end on the surface is  $\Lambda'$ .

The following lemma and proposition will also be used in the next section.

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an infinite minimal geodesic lamination of  $S$ . Then  $\Lambda$  has at least two boundary leaves.*

*Proof.* The lift of  $\Lambda$  to the universal cover of  $S$  is a geodesic lamination  $\hat{\Lambda}$  of the hyperbolic plane. Each component of the complement of  $\hat{\Lambda}$  is an ideal polygon. The images in  $S$  of two boundary leaves of such a polygon give the desired boundary leaves of  $\Lambda$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.10** (see [2], I 4.2.14 p. 81). *The finite laminations are dense in the space of geodesic laminations equipped with the Hausdorff topology. Hence the same holds for the Thurston topology.*

### 3. ON THE ACTION OF A HOMEOMORPHISM OF $\mathcal{GL}(S)$

We denote by  $\mathcal{O}(S)$  the set of open subsets of  $S$  and we fix an element  $\Lambda$  of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ . We consider the sets

$$\mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S) = \{V \in \mathcal{O}(S) : V \cap \Lambda \neq \emptyset\} \subset \mathcal{O}(S)$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}(\Lambda) = \cap_{V \in \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)} \mathcal{U}_V \subset \mathcal{GL}(S).$$

We have the following.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ . Then  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  if and only if  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$ . For any  $V \in \mathcal{O}_{\Lambda_1}(S)$ , we consider the set  $\mathcal{U}_V$ . Then  $\Lambda_2 \cap V \neq \emptyset$ , hence  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}_V$ . Therefore  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ .

Conversely, assume  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ . If  $\Lambda_1$  is not a subset of  $\Lambda_2$ , then there exists  $x \in \Lambda_1$  with  $x \notin \Lambda_2$ . Since  $\Lambda_2$  is a compact subset of  $S$ , there exists  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that the open ball  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  does not intersect  $\Lambda_2$ . This implies that  $\Lambda_2 \notin \mathcal{U}_{B(x, \varepsilon)}$ . This is a contradiction since  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ . Hence  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ . Then  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  if and only if  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2) \subset \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ .*

*Proof.* First assume that  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  and let  $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2)$ . Then  $\Lambda' \cap V \neq \emptyset$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{O}(S)$  with  $V \cap \Lambda_2 \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\Lambda' \cap V \neq \emptyset$  for each  $V \in \mathcal{O}(S)$  with  $V \cap \Lambda_1 \neq \emptyset$ . Therefore  $\Lambda' \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ .

Now assume that  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2) \subset \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ . Obviously,  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2)$  and hence  $\Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ . From Lemma 3.1, this implies that  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Assume that  $f$  is a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology. If  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ , then  $f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)) = \mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda))$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that

$$\mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda)) \subset f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)) \quad \forall \Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S).$$

Indeed, this implies

$$\mathcal{U}(f^{-1}(\Lambda)) \subset f^{-1}(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)),$$

which implies

$$f(\mathcal{U}(f^{-1}(\Lambda))) \subset \mathcal{U}(\Lambda),$$

which implies

$$f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_0)) \subset \mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda_0)),$$

where  $\Lambda_0 = f^{-1}(\Lambda)$ . Thus, we get  $f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_0)) \subset \mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda_0))$  for any  $\Lambda_0$  in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$ .

To prove the assertion, we start by

$$f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda)) = f(\cap \{\mathcal{U}_V : V \in \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)\}) = \cap \{f(\mathcal{U}_V) : V \in \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)\}.$$

Now let  $V_0$  be an arbitrary element of  $\mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)$ . Then,  $\Lambda$  is in  $\mathcal{U}_{V_0}$  and  $f(\Lambda)$  is in  $f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0})$ . But  $f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0}) \in \mathcal{T}$  (that is,  $f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0})$  is an open set of Thurston's topology). Therefore, there exist  $V_1, \dots, V_n \in \mathcal{O}_{f(\Lambda)}(S)$  such that

$$\cap_{1 \leq i \leq n} \mathcal{U}_{V_i} \subset f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0}).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\cap \{\mathcal{U}_V : V \in \mathcal{O}_{f(\Lambda)}(S)\} \subset f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0}),$$

which implies that for every  $V_0 \in \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)$ , we have

$$\mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda)) \subset f(\mathcal{U}_{V_0}).$$

Finally, we obtain

$$\mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda)) \subset \cap \{f(\mathcal{U}_V) : V \in \mathcal{O}_\Lambda(S)\}$$

which implies  $\mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda)) \subset f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda))$ .  $\square$

From the above lemmata, we obtain the following:

**Corollary 3.4.** *Assume that  $f$  is a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology and let  $\Lambda_1, \Lambda_2 \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ . Then  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  implies that  $f(\Lambda_1) \subset f(\Lambda_2)$ .*

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.2, the inclusion  $\Lambda_1 \subset \Lambda_2$  implies that  $\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2) \subset \mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1)$ . Since  $f$  is a bijection, we have  $f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_2)) \subset f(\mathcal{U}(\Lambda_1))$ . From Lemma 3.3 we get  $\mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda_2)) \subset \mathcal{U}(f(\Lambda_1))$  which implies again, by Lemma 3.2, that  $f(\Lambda_1) \subset f(\Lambda_2)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $f$  be a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology. Then  $f$  sends a maximal (respectively minimal) geodesic lamination of  $S$  to a maximal (respectively minimal) geodesic lamination of  $S$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Lambda$  be a maximal geodesic lamination of  $S$ . If  $f(\Lambda)$  is not maximal then there is a maximal geodesic lamination  $\Theta$  such that  $f(\Lambda) \subsetneq \Theta$ . Let  $\Lambda' = f^{-1}(\Theta)$ . Then, by Corollary 3.4, we have  $\Lambda \subsetneq \Lambda'$  which contradicts the maximality of  $\Lambda$ .

Likewise, let  $\Lambda$  be a minimal geodesic lamination of  $S$ . If  $f(\Lambda)$  is not minimal, then there exists a lamination  $\Theta$  such that  $\Theta \subsetneq f(\Lambda)$ . Let  $\Lambda' = f^{-1}(\Theta)$ . Then, from Corollary 3.4 again, we have  $\Lambda' \subsetneq \Lambda$ , which contradicts the minimality of  $\Lambda$ .  $\square$

From Theorem 2.8 (III), every  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$  has a finite number of sublaminations. Thus, we give the following definition.

**Definition 3.6.** Let  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{GL}(S)$ . A *chain of sublaminations* of  $\Lambda$  is a finite sequence  $(\Lambda_i)$ ,  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n$  of sublaminations of  $\Lambda$  such that  $\emptyset \neq \Lambda_n \subsetneq \Lambda_{n-1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_0 = \Lambda$ . We denote such a chain by  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$ . The integer  $n$  will be called the *length* of  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$  and will be denoted by  $l(\mathcal{C}_\Lambda)$ .

A chain of sublaminations  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$  will be called *maximal* if its length is maximal among all chains of sublaminations of  $\Lambda$ .

The length of a maximal chain of sublaminations  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$  of  $\Lambda$  depends only on  $\Lambda$ . Therefore the number  $l(\mathcal{C}_\Lambda)$  will be referred to as the length of  $\Lambda$  and will be denoted by  $\text{length}(\Lambda)$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $f$  be a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology and let  $\Lambda_n \subsetneq \Lambda_{n-1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_0 = \Lambda$  be a maximal chain of sublaminations of  $\Lambda$ . Then  $f(\Lambda_n) \subsetneq f(\Lambda_{n-1}) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq f(\Lambda_1) \subsetneq f(\Lambda_0) = f(\Lambda)$  is a maximal chain of sublaminations of  $f(\Lambda)$  and  $\text{length}(\Lambda_k) = \text{length}(f(\Lambda_k))$  for each  $k = 0, 1, \dots, n$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows immediately from Corollary 3.4.  $\square$

We call a *generalized pair of pants* a hyperbolic surface which is homeomorphic to a sphere with three holes, a hole being either a geodesic boundary component or a cusp.

Now we can prove the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $f$  be a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology. Then,*

- (1)  *$f$  sends any maximal finite lamination which contains a collection of curves that decompose  $S$  into generalized pair of pants to a maximal finite lamination that has the same property.*
- (2)  *$f$  sends any laminations whose leaves are all closed to a lamination having the same property. Furthermore if such a lamination  $\Lambda$  has  $k$  components then  $f(\Lambda)$  has also  $k$  components.*
- (3)  *$f$  sends finite laminations to finite laminations.*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $\Lambda$  be a maximal geodesic lamination. From Theorem 2.8,  $S - \Lambda$  consists of finitely many open components.

*Claim 1:* *Let  $U$  be a component of  $S - \Lambda$ . Then, the completion  $C(U)$  of  $U$  is a hyperbolic surface which is isometric either to a hyperbolic ideal triangle or to a surface of genus 0 with a cusp and an open geodesic as boundary. The latter will be referred to as a cusped hyperbolic monogon ; it is obtained from a hyperbolic ideal triangle by gluing together two sides of this ideal triangle.*

*Proof of Claim 1.* The surface  $C(U)$  is a complete hyperbolic surface of finite area. Therefore  $C(U)$  has finitely many components which are either closed geodesics or open geodesics. We may easily verify that if  $C(U)$  is not of the type described in the claim then the lamination  $\Lambda$  would not be maximal because we could add open geodesics  $l_i$  to  $\Lambda$  and construct a lamination  $\Lambda' \supsetneq \Lambda$ . This proves Claim 1.

Now let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  be the leaves of  $\Lambda$  which are boundary geodesics of the completion  $C(U)$  of some component  $U$  of  $S - \Lambda$ . The leaves  $\lambda_i$  can be of two types:

- (i) an open geodesic of  $S$  which is an isolated leaf of  $\Lambda$ ;
- (ii) an open geodesic of  $S$  which is a leaf isolated from one side in  $\Lambda$ .

A geodesic of type (ii) appears as a boundary leaf of a minimal infinite sublamination of  $\Lambda$ . Among the  $\{\lambda_i\}$ , we may assume, without loss of generality, that  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$  are the isolated leaves of  $\Lambda$ , for  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . From Theorem 2.8, it follows that if  $\Lambda$  is a finite maximal geodesic lamination then  $k = n$  and that if  $\Lambda$  is a maximal infinite geodesic lamination which is also minimal then  $k = 0$ .

To the leaves  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  of  $\Lambda$  we add the leaves  $c_1, \dots, c_m$  of  $\Lambda$  which are simple closed geodesics, if there exist any. Let  $A_\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, c_1, \dots, c_m\}$ .

We define a *generating set* for a geodesic lamination to be a set  $\mathcal{A} = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k\}$  of leaves of  $\Lambda$  such that the union of the closures of the leaves that belong to  $\mathcal{A}$  is the lamination  $\Lambda$ . It follows from Theorem 2.8 that every geodesic lamination on  $S$  has a finite generating set.

Our terminology is motivated by Claim 2 that follows now.

*Claim 2:* *The set  $A_\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, c_1, \dots, c_m\}$  is a generating set for  $\Lambda$  and any proper sublamination of  $\Lambda$  is the closure of some proper subset of  $A_\Lambda$ .*

*Proof of Claim 2.* The claim follows immediately from the definition of  $A$  and from Theorem 2.8 (III).

It is well-known and easy to see, using an Euler characteristic count, that the maximum number of pairwise disjoint simple closed geodesics in  $S$  is equal to  $3g - 3 + b$  and that these geodesics cut  $S$  into  $2g - 2 + b$  hyperbolic generalized pairs of pants. It is also easy to see that the maximum number of open geodesics  $l_i$  of  $S$  which decompose  $S$  into hyperbolic ideal triangles is equal to  $6g - 6 + 3b$ .

*Claim 3:* *If  $\Lambda$  is a maximal finite geodesic lamination that contains a generalized pair of pants decomposition  $P$  then a maximal chain of sublamination of  $\Lambda$  has length  $9g - 9 + 3b$ .*

*Proof of Claim 3.* The lamination  $\Lambda$  contains  $3g - 3 + b$  simple closed geodesics, say  $c_1, \dots, c_{3g-3+b}$ , which cut  $S$  into generalized pairs of pants, and additional open isolated geodesics, say  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r$ , such that each  $\lambda_i$  spirals about some  $c_j$ . We may

add to  $\lambda_i$  open geodesics  $\lambda'_k$ , which from one direction abut to a cusp and from the other direction spiral about some  $c_j$ , such that all the geodesics  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda'_i$  decompose  $S$  into hyperbolic ideal triangles. Since the total number of  $\lambda_i$  and  $\lambda'_i$  is equal to  $6g - 6 + 3b$  we deduce that the number  $r$  of  $\lambda_i$  is equal to  $6g - 6 + 2b$ . Therefore the set  $A_\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{6g-6+2b}, c_1, \dots, c_{3g-3+b}\}$  is a generating set of  $\Lambda$ . From Claim 2, a chain of sublaminations  $\Lambda_n \subsetneq \Lambda_{n-1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_0 = \Lambda$  is maximal if and only if for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $\Lambda_k - \Lambda_{k-1}$  is a single leaf belonging to  $A_\Lambda$ . Such a sequence  $\Lambda_i$  can be constructed as follows: From  $\Lambda_0 = \Lambda$  we first remove, one by one, all leaves  $\lambda_i$ ; after removing all these leaves we continue removing, one by one, all leaves  $c_j$ . Obviously  $n = 9g - 9 + 3b$ .

*Claim 4: Let  $\Lambda$  be a maximal finite geodesic lamination which does not contain a generalized pants decomposition. Then  $\text{length}(\Lambda) < 9g - 9 + 3b$ .*

*Proof of Claim 4.* Since  $\Lambda$  does not contain a generalized pants decomposition it follows that if  $c_1, \dots, c_k$  are the closed geodesics in  $\Lambda$ , then  $k$  is strictly smaller than  $3g - 3 + b$ . Now as in the proof of Claim 3, we may prove that  $\Lambda$  contains additional open geodesics  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{6g-6+2b}$  which spiral about the  $c_j$ 's. Obviously, a maximal chain  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$  of sublaminations of  $\Lambda$  has length less than  $9g - 9 + 3b$ .

*Claim 5: Let  $\Lambda$  be a maximal infinite geodesic lamination. Then  $\text{length}(\Lambda) < 9g - 9 + 3b$ .*

Consider a maximal chain of sublaminations of  $\Lambda$ , say  $\Lambda_k \subsetneq \Lambda_{k-1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_0 = \Lambda$ . Let  $A_\Lambda = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, c_1, \dots, c_m\}$  be a generating set of  $\Lambda$ , where each  $\lambda_i$  is an open geodesic and each  $c_i$  is a closed geodesic, and we assume that the generating set  $A_\Lambda$  is *minimal* in the sense that no proper subset of  $A_\Lambda$  is a generating set of  $\Lambda$ .

First, we prove that  $m < 3g - 3 + b$ . We know that  $m \leq 3g - 3 + b$ . If  $m = 3g - 3 + b$  then the closed geodesics cut  $S$  into generalized pairs of pants. This implies that a minimal sublamination, say  $\Lambda'$ , of  $\Lambda$  with infinitely many leaves must be in the interior of a generalized pair of pants. But it is easy to see that such a sublamination  $\Lambda'$  does not exist. Therefore  $m < 3g - 3 + b$ .

Second, we prove that  $n \leq 6g - 6 + 2b$ . By Theorem 2.8, the leaves  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  are either isolated open leaves or boundary leaves. Since  $\Lambda$  is maximal, for each component  $U$  of  $S - \Lambda$  the completion  $C(U)$  is either a hyperbolic ideal triangle or a cusped hyperbolic monogon. The area of every such surface is equal to  $\pi$ , therefore, from the Gauss-Bonnet theorem the number of components  $U$  is equal to  $4g - 4 + 2b$ . Now, each hyperbolic ideal triangle has three sides and each cusped hyperbolic monogon has one side. On the other hand the number of cusped hyperbolic monogons is equal to  $b$ . Therefore the total number of sides of  $C(U)$  is  $3(4g - 4 + 2b) - 2b = 12g - 12 + 4b$ . Now if a leaf  $\lambda_i$  is isolated it belongs exactly to two components  $C(U)$ . If a leaf  $\lambda_i$  is not isolated then it belongs to a minimal sublamination of  $\Lambda$ , say  $K_i$ . From Lemma 2.9,  $K_i$  contains at least two boundary leaves and we take  $\lambda_i$  to be one of them. Therefore, among all the sides of the given  $C(U)$ , at least two of them are boundary leaves of  $K_i$ . This implies that  $n \leq \frac{12g-12+4b}{2} = 6g - 6 + 2b$ . Assume that  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r \in A_\Lambda$ ,  $0 \leq r < n$  are isolated leaves and  $\lambda_{r+1}, \dots, \lambda_n \in A_\Lambda$  are isolated from one side. Every  $\lambda_s$  with  $s > r$  belongs to a unique minimal infinite sublamination  $\Lambda'_s$  of  $\Lambda$ .

Now the maximal chain of sublaminations  $\Lambda_k \subsetneq \Lambda_{k-1} \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Lambda_1 \subsetneq \Lambda_0 = \Lambda$  of  $\Lambda$  is constructed as follows: We pass from  $\Lambda_{i-1}$  to  $\Lambda_i$  by removing all the isolated open geodesics  $\lambda_i \in A_\Lambda$  with  $i \leq r$ , then every minimal infinite sublamination  $\Lambda'_i$  of  $\Lambda$  and every closed geodesic  $c_j \in A_\Lambda$ . Obviously the length of  $\Lambda$  is less than  $9g - 9 + 3b$ . This finishes the proof of Claim 5.

Now, from Lemma 3.7 the homeomorphism  $f$  preserves the length of a maximal lamination  $\Lambda$  and this finishes the proof of (1).

To prove (2), let  $K$  be a lamination consisting of  $k$  closed geodesics. Then  $\text{length}(K) = k - 1$ . Consider a maximal finite geodesic lamination  $\Lambda$  containing a generalized pants decomposition  $P$  with  $K \subset P$ . We note that in a maximal chain of sublaminations  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$  of  $\Lambda$  only the sublamination consisting of  $k$  closed geodesics have length  $k - 1$ . From (1),  $f(\Lambda)$  is a maximal finite geodesic lamination containing a pants decomposition. From Lemma 3.7, for each sublamination  $\Lambda_i$  belonging to  $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda$ , we have  $\text{length}(\Lambda_i) = \text{length}(f(\Lambda_i))$ . Therefore  $f(K)$  consists of  $k$  closed geodesics.

Now we prove (3). Let  $K$  be a finite lamination. Obviously, a minimal sublamination of  $K$  consists of a single closed geodesic. Assume that  $f(K)$  is not finite. Then there is an infinite minimal sublamination  $\Lambda_0$  of  $f(K)$ . From Lemma 3.5,  $\Lambda_0$  is the image of a minimal sublamination  $K_0$  of  $K$ , via  $f$ , i.e.  $f(K_0) = \Lambda_0$ . But from (2),  $f(K_0)$  consists of a single closed geodesic. Therefore we have a contradiction, which proves (3).  $\square$

#### 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We first prove Theorem 1.1 in the case where  $f$  is a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  for the Thurston topology. We start by noting that there is a natural identification between the subset  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$  and the complex of curves  $\mathcal{C}(S)$  of  $S$ . With this, from Proposition 3.8,  $f$  induces an automorphism of  $\mathcal{C}(S)$ . From [4], [6] and [5] and under the hypothesis of Theorem 1.1, we obtain a homeomorphism  $h : S \rightarrow S$  such that  $h_* = f$  on  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$ . From Proposition 2.10,  $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$  is a dense subset of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Thurston topology. On the other hand, from Corollary 2.5, each converging net in  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  converges to a unique lamination with respect to the Thurston topology. Therefore it suffices to prove that  $h_* = f$  on  $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$ .

Composing  $f$  with  $(h_*)^{-1}$ , if necessary, it suffices to assume that  $f = \text{id}$  on  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$  and prove that  $f = \text{id}$  on  $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$ . To do it, we first prove two lemmas:

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $\Lambda = \{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$  be a geodesic lamination consisting of two disjoint simple closed geodesics  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$  and one open geodesic  $\gamma$  spiraling in one direction about  $\gamma_1$  and in the other direction about  $\gamma_2$ . Then  $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* We take a generalized pair of pants decomposition  $P$  and a finite geodesic lamination  $\Lambda_P$  such that

- (1)  $\Lambda \subset \Lambda_P$ ;
- (2) the geodesics in  $P$  are leaves of  $\Lambda_P$ ;
- (3) for each component  $\gamma$  of  $P$ , there are leaves of  $\Lambda_P$  spiraling about  $\gamma$  from different sides of  $\gamma$  and any two leaves of  $\Lambda_P$  that spiral about  $\gamma$  from different sides of  $\gamma$  induce opposite orientations on  $\gamma$ .

Such a lamination  $\Lambda_P$  can be approximated in the Hausdorff topology (and hence in the Thurston topology) by a sequence  $C_n$  of simple closed geodesics, where the  $C_n$  are viewed as elements of  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$ . This implies that  $f(\Lambda_P) = \Lambda_P$ . Indeed,  $C_n \rightarrow \Lambda_P$  and therefore  $f(C_n) \rightarrow f(\Lambda_P)$ . This implies, since  $f$  is the identity on  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$ , that  $C_n \rightarrow f(\Lambda_P)$ . Thus, from Corollary 2.5 we deduce that  $\Lambda_P = f(\Lambda_P)$ .

Assume now that  $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda'$ . We recall that  $f$  is the identity map on  $\mathcal{CGL}(S)$ . From Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.4, we deduce that  $\Lambda' = \{\gamma', \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ , where  $\gamma'$  spirals about  $\gamma_1$  and about  $\gamma_2$ . We prove that  $\gamma' = \gamma$ .

We can find a surface  $Q \subset S$  with geodesic boundary containing the lamination  $\Lambda$  and which is the closure of a component of  $S - P$  such that  $Q$  is of one of the following types:

- (i) a torus with one boundary component, with  $\partial Q = \gamma_1$  or  $\partial Q = \gamma_2$ ;
- (ii) a pair of pants with no cusps, with  $\gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2 \subset \partial Q$ ;

(iii) a generalized pair of pants with a single cusp with  $\partial Q = \gamma_1 \cup \gamma_2$ .

First we show that  $\gamma' \subset Q$ . Let  $P_\gamma = P \cup \{\gamma\} \subset \Lambda_P$ . It is not hard to show, using Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.4, that  $f(P_\gamma) = P \cup \{\gamma'\}$ . Therefore  $P \cap \{\gamma'\} = \emptyset$ . This implies that if  $\gamma'$  is not contained in  $Q$  then it is contained in some generalized pair of pants  $Q'$  with  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \partial Q'$  and  $\text{Int}(Q) \cap \text{Int}(Q') = \emptyset$ . Thus, we may find a simple closed geodesic  $\gamma_0$  of  $S$  which intersects only one of the geodesics  $\gamma, \gamma'$ . To prove the last statement we need the assumption on the topological type of  $S$  that we made in the introduction. Assume without loss of generality that  $\gamma \cap \gamma_0 = \emptyset$  and  $\gamma' \cap \gamma_0 \neq \emptyset$ . From Corollary 3.4 the lamination  $\Lambda_1 = \{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_0\}$  is sent to a lamination  $\Lambda'_1$  which should contain the geodesics  $\gamma', \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_0$ . But this is impossible since  $\gamma' \cap \gamma_0 \neq \emptyset$  and hence  $Q' = Q$ .

Now in Cases (ii) and (ii) there is a unique leaf of  $\Lambda_P$  contained in  $Q$ , namely the leaf  $\gamma$ , which spirals about  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ . This implies that  $\gamma' = \gamma$  since  $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda' \subset \Lambda_P$  and  $\gamma' \subset Q$ .

Consider now Case (i). Without loss of generality we can assume that  $\partial Q = \gamma_2$ . In this case we assume furthermore that the lamination  $\Lambda_P$  which contains  $\Lambda$  and which satisfies the requirements (1)-(3) above is chosen such that  $\Lambda_P \cap Q = \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma, \delta\}$  where  $\delta$  is a geodesic spiraling about  $\gamma_1$  in both directions but from different sides of  $\gamma_1$ . Therefore, again there is a unique leaf of  $\Lambda_P$  contained in  $Q$ , namely the geodesic  $\gamma$ , which spirals about  $\gamma_1$  and  $\gamma_2$ . Thus, we deduce again that  $\gamma' = \gamma$  and Lemma 4.1 is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $\Lambda = \{\gamma, \gamma_1\}$  be a geodesic lamination consisting of one simple closed geodesic  $\gamma_1$  and one open geodesic  $\gamma$  spiraling in both directions about  $\gamma_1$ . Then  $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* First we find a surface  $Q \subset S$  with geodesic boundary containing  $\gamma, \gamma_1$  such that  $Q$  is one of the following surfaces:

- (i) a torus with one boundary component such that  $\gamma_1$  is not the boundary of  $Q$ ;
- (ii) a torus with one boundary component such that  $\gamma_1 = \partial Q$ ;
- (iii) a generalized pair of pants with  $\gamma_1 \subset \partial Q$ .

Assume that  $f(\Lambda) = \Lambda'$ . From Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.4, we deduce that  $\Lambda' = \{\gamma', \gamma_1\}$ , where  $\gamma'$  spirals in both directions about  $\gamma_1$ . As in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we can prove that  $\gamma' \subset Q$ .

In all cases (i)-(iii) we may verify that there is a unique leaf of  $\Lambda_P$  contained in  $Q$ , namely the leaf  $\gamma$ , which spirals about  $\gamma_1$ . As in Lemma 4.1, this implies that  $\gamma' = \gamma$ . Therefore,  $\Lambda = \Lambda'$  and this proves Lemma 4.2.  $\square$

Now we can prove that  $f = \text{id}$  on  $\mathcal{FGL}(S)$ . Indeed, consider  $K \in \mathcal{FGL}(S)$  such that  $f(K) = K' \neq K$ . Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that there is a leaf  $\gamma$  of  $K$  such that  $\gamma$  is not a leaf of  $K'$ . First we remark that  $\gamma$  cannot be a closed geodesic since  $f(\{\gamma\}) = \{\gamma\}$  and by Corollary 3.4  $f(\{\gamma\}) = \{\gamma\} \subset f(K)$ . Let  $\gamma$  be an open geodesic and assume that  $\gamma$  spirals about two disjoint closed geodesics  $\gamma_1, \gamma_2$ . (The case where  $\gamma$  spirals about a single closed geodesics  $\gamma_1$  in both directions is treated similarly using Lemma 4.2.) Consider the lamination  $\{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ . By Lemma 4.1,  $f(\{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}) = \{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$  and hence  $\{\gamma, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \subset f(K)$  by Corollary 3.4. Therefore  $\gamma$  is a leaf of  $f(K)$ , a contradiction which implies that  $f(K) = K$ .

Finally, assume that  $f$  is a homeomorphism of  $\mathcal{GL}(S)$  with respect to the Hausdorff topology. From Proposition 2.7,  $f$  is also a homeomorphism with respect to the Thurston topology. Therefore  $f$  is induced by a homeomorphism of  $S$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] H. Busemann, *The geometry of geodesics*, Acad. Press, 1955.

- [2] R. Canary, D. Epstein, P. Green, *Fundamentals of Hyperbolic Manifolds: Selected Expositions*, LMS, Lecture Note Series 328, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- [3] A. Casson, S. Bleiler, *Automorphisms of Surfaces after Nielsen and Thurston*, London Math. Society, Student Texts 9, 1988.
- [4] N. V. Ivanov, Automorphisms of Teichmüller modular groups, Lecture Notes in Math., No. 1346, Springer-Verlag, Berlin and New York, 1988, 199–270.
- [5] F. Luo, *Automorphisms of the complex of curves*, Topology, 39(2), 283–298, 2000.
- [6] M. Korkmaz, *Automorphisms of the complex of curves on punctured spheres and punctured tori*, Topology and its Appl. 95(2), 85–111, 1999.
- [7] K. Matsuzaki and M. Taniguchi, *Hyperbolic Manifolds and Kleinian Groups*, Oxford Science Publications, 1998.
- [8] K. Ohshika, Reduced Bers boundaries of Teichmüller spaces, preprint, 2011, arxiv:1103.4680v2.
- [9] K. Ohshika, A note on the rigidity of unmeasured lamination space, preprint, 2011.
- [10] J. P. Otal, *Le théorème d’hyperbolization pour les variétés fibrées de dimension 3*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque 235, 1996.
- [11] A. Papadopoulos, *A rigidity theorem for the mapping class group action on the space of unmeasured foliations on a surface*, Proceedings of AMS, 136, p. 4453–4460, 2008.
- [12] W. Thurston, *The Geometry and Topology of Three Manifolds*, Princeton Lecture Notes, 1979.
- [13] S. Willard, *general Topology*, Addison Wesley, 1970.

CHARALAMPOS CHARITOS, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS, AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, IERA ODOS 75, 118 55 ATHENS, GREECE  
*E-mail address:* bakis@aua.gr

IOANNIS PAPADOPOPOULOS, LABORATORY OF MATHEMATICS, AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, IERA ODOS 75, 118 55 ATHENS, GREECE  
*E-mail address:* papadoperakis@aua.gr

ATHANASE PAPADOPOULOS, UNIVERSITÉ DE STRASBOURG AND CNRS, 7 RUE RENÉ DESCARTES, 67084 STRASBOURG CEDEX, FRANCE  
*E-mail address:* athanase.papadopoulos@math.unistra.fr