SHEAVES: FROM LERAY TO GROTHENDIECK AND SATO

by

Pierre Schapira

Abstract. — We show how the ideas of Leray (sheaf theory), Grothendieck (derived categories) and Sato (microlocal analysis) lead to the microlocal theory of sheaves which allows one to reduce many problems of linear partial differential equations to problems of microlocal geometry. Moreover, sheaves on Grothendieck topologies are a natural tool to treat growth conditions which appear in Analysis.

***Résumé* (Faisceaux: de Leray à Grothendieck et Sato).** — Nous montrons comment les idées de Leray (théorie des faisceaux) Grothendieck (catégories dérivées) et Sato (analyse microlocale) conduisent à la théorie microlocale des faisceaux qui permet de réduire de nombreux problèmes d'équations aux dérivées partielles linéaires à des problèmes de géométrie microlocale. Les faisceaux sur les topologies de Grothendieck sont de plus un outil naturel pour traiter les conditions de croissance qui apparaissent en Analyse.

1. Introduction

The "Scientific work" of Jean Leray has recently been published [**7**]. It is divided in three volumes:

(a) Topologie et théorème du point fixe (algebraic topology),
(b) Équations aux dérivées partielles réelles et mécanique des fluides (non linear analysis),
(c) Fonctions de plusieurs variables complexes et équations aux dérivées partielles holomorphes (linear analytic partial differential equations, LPDE for short).

As we shall see, (a) and (c) are in fact closely related, and even complementary, when translated into the language of sheaves with a dose of homological algebra. Recall that sheaf theory, as well as the essential tool of homological algebra known under the vocable of spectral sequences, were introduced in the 40's by Leray. I do

2000 ***Mathematics Subject Classification.*** — 35A27, 32C38.
Key words and phrases. — sheaves, D-modules, microsupport, microlocal analysis.

not intend to give an exhaustive survey of Leray's fundamental contributions in these areas of Mathematics. I merely want to illustrate by some examples the fact that his ideas, combined with those of Grothendieck [**1**] and Sato [**10**], [**11**], lead to an algebraic and geometric vision of linear analysis, what Sato calls Algebraic Analysis.

I will explain how the classical functional spaces treated by the analysts in the 60's are now replaced by functorial spaces, that is, sheaves of generalized holomorphic functions on a complex manifold X or, more precisely, complexes of sheaves $R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$, where G is an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf on the real underlying manifold to X, the seminal example being that of Sato's hyperfunctions [**10**]. I will also explain how a general system of LPDE is now interpreted as a coherent $\mathcal{D}_X$-module $\mathcal{M}$, where $\mathcal{D}_X$ denotes the sheaf of rings of holomorphic differential operators [**3**], [**11**].

The study of LPDE with values in a sheaf of generalized holomorphic functions is then reduced to that of the complex $R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, F)$, where $F = R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is the complex of holomorphic solutions of the system $\mathcal{M}$.

At this stage, one can forget that one is working on a complex manifold X and dealing with LPDE, keeping only in mind two geometrical informations, the micro-support of G and that of F (see [**4**]), this last one being nothing but the characteristic variety of $\mathcal{M}$.

However, classical sheaf theory does not allow one to treat usual spaces of analysis, much of which involving growth conditions which are not of local nature, and to conclude, I will briefly explain how the use of Grothendieck topologies, in a very special and easy situation, allows one to overcome this difficulty. References are made to [**4**] and [**5**].

2. The Cauchy-Kowalevsky theorem, revisited

At the heart of LPDE is the Cauchy-Kowalevsky theorem (C-K theorem, for short). Let us recall its classical formulation, and its improvement, by Schauder, Petrowsky and finally Leray. As we shall see later, the C-K theorem, in its precise form given by Leray, is the only analytical tool to treat LPDE. All other ingredients are of topological or algebraic nature, sheaf theory and homological algebra.

The classical C-K theorem is as follows. Consider an open subset X of $\mathbb{C}^n$, with holomorphic coordinates $(z_1, \dots, z_n)$, and let Y denote the complex hypersurface with equation $\{z_1 = 0\}$. Let P be a holomorphic differential operator of order m. Hence

$$P = \sum_{|\alpha| \leq m} a_\alpha(z) \partial_z^\alpha$$

where $\alpha = (\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ is a multi-index, $|\alpha| = \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n$, the $a_\alpha(z)$'s are holomorphic functions on X, and ∂_z^α is a monomial in the derivations $\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i}$.

One says that Y is non-characteristic if $a_{(m,0\dots,0)}$, the coefficient of $\partial_{z_1}^m$, does not vanish.

The Cauchy problem is formulated as follows. Given a holomorphic function g on X and m holomorphic functions $h = (h_0, \ldots, h_{m-1})$ on Y, one looks for f holomorphic in a neighborhood of Y in X, solution of

$$\begin{cases} Pf = g, \\ \gamma_Y(f) = (h), \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\gamma_Y(f) = (f|_Y, \partial_1 f|_Y, \ldots, {\partial_1}^{m-1} f|_Y)$ is the restriction to Y of f and its $(m-1)$ first derivative with respect to z_1.

The C-K theorem asserts that if Y is non-characteristic with respect to P, the Cauchy problem admits a unique solution in a neighborhood of Y. Schauder and Petrovsky realized that the domain of existence of f depends only on X and the principal symbol of P, and Leray gave a precised version of this theorem:

Theorem 2.1. — *(The C-K theorem revisited by Leray.) Assume that X is relatively compact in $\mathbb{C}^n$ and the coefficients a_α are holomorphic in a neighborhood of $\overline{X}$. Assume moreover that $a_{m,0\ldots,0} \equiv 1$. Then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that if g is holomorphic in a ball $B(a, R)$ centered at $a \in Y$ and of radius R, with $B(a, R) \subset X$, and (h) is holomorphic in $B(a, R) \cap Y$, then f is holomorphic in the ball $B(a, \delta R)$ of radius δR.*

This result seems purely technical, and its interest is not obvious. However it plays a fundamental role in the study of propagation, as illustrated by Zerner's result below.

To state it, we need to work free of coordinates. The principal symbol of P, denoted by $\sigma(P)$, is defined by

$$\sigma(P)(z; \zeta) = \sum_{|\alpha|=m} a_\alpha(z)\zeta^\alpha.$$

This is indeed a well-defined function on T^*X, the complex cotangent bundle to X. Identifying X to $X_\mathbb{R}$, the real underlying manifold, there is a natural identification of $(T^*X)_\mathbb{R}$ and the real cotangent bundle $T^*(X_\mathbb{R})$. The condition that Y is non-characteristic for P may be translated by saying that $\sigma(P)$ does not vanish on the conormal bundle to Y outside the zero-section, and one defines similarly the notion of being non characteristic for a real hypersurface.

Proposition 2.2. — **[13]** *Let Ω be an open set in X with smooth boundary S (hence S is a real hypersurface of class C^1 and Ω is locally on one side of S). Assume that S is non-characteristic with respect to P. Let f be holomorphic in Ω and assume that Pf extends holomorphically through the boundary S. Then f extends itself holomorphically through the boundary S.*

The proof is very simple (see also **[2]**). Using the classical C-K theorem, we may assume that $Pf = 0$. Then one solves the homogeneous Cauchy problem $Pf = 0, \gamma_Y(f) = \gamma_Y(f)$, along complex hyperplanes closed to the boundary. The precised C-K theorem tells us that the solution (which is nothing but f by the uniqueness) is holomorphic in a domain which makes an angle", hence crosses S for Y closed enough to S.

A similar argument shows that it is possible to solve the equation $Pf = g$ is the space of functions holomorphic in Ω in a neighborhood of each $x \in \partial\Omega$, and with some more work one proves

Theorem 2.3. — *Assume that $\partial\Omega$ is non-characteristic with respect to P. Then for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, P induces an isomorphism on $H^k_{X\setminus\Omega}(\mathcal{O}_X)|_{\partial\Omega}$.*

3. Microsupport

The conclusion of Theorem 2.3 may be formulated in a much more general framework, forgetting both PDE and complex analysis.

Let X denote a *real* manifold of class C^∞, let k be a field, and let F be a bounded complex of sheaves of k-vector spaces on X (more precisely, F is an object of $D^b(k_X)$, the bounded derived category of sheaves on X). As usual, T^*X denotes the cotangent bundle to X.

Definition 3.1. — The microsupport $SS(F)$ of F is the closed conic subset of T^*X defined as follows. Let U be an open subset of T^*X. Then $U \cap SS(F) = \emptyset$ if and only if for any $x \in X$ and any real C^∞-function $\varphi : X \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $\varphi(x) = 0, d\varphi(x) \in U$, one has:

$$(R\Gamma_{\varphi\geq 0}(F))_x = 0.$$

In other words, F has no cohomology supported by the closed half spaces whose conormals do not belong to its microsupport.

Let X be a complex manifold, P a holomorphic differential operator and let $Sol(P)$ be the complex of holomorphic solutions of P:

$$Sol(P) := 0 \to \mathcal{O}_X \underset{P}{\to} \mathcal{O}_X \to 0,$$

then Theorem 2.3 reads as:

$$SS(Sol(P)) \subset char(P). \tag{3.1}$$

This result can easily been extended to general systems (determined or not) of LPDE.

Let $\mathcal{D}_X$ denote the sheaf of rings of holomorphic differential operators, and let $\mathcal{M}$ be a left coherent $\mathcal{D}_X$-module. Locally on X, $\mathcal{M}$ may be represented as the cokernel of a matrix $\cdot P_0$ of differential operators acting on the right. By classical arguments of analytic geometry (Hilbert's syzygies theorem), one shows that $\mathcal{M}$ is locally isomorphic to the cohomology of a bounded complex

$$\mathcal{M}^\bullet := 0 \to \mathcal{D}_X^{N_r} \to \cdots \to \mathcal{D}_X^{N_1} \xrightarrow[\cdot P_0]{} \mathcal{D}_X^{N_0} \to 0.$$

The complex of holomorphic solutions of $\mathcal{M}$, denoted $Sol(\mathcal{M})$, (or better in the language of derived categories, $R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)$), is obtained by applying $\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\cdot, \mathcal{O}_X)$ to $\mathcal{M}^\bullet$. Hence

$$Sol(\mathcal{M}) := 0 \to \mathcal{O}_X^{N_0} \underset{P_0\cdot}{\longrightarrow} \mathcal{O}_X^{N_1} \to \cdots \mathcal{O}_X^{N_r} \to 0,$$

where now $P_0\cdot$ operates on the left.

One defines naturally the characteristic variety of $\mathcal{M}$, denoted $char(\mathcal{M})$, a closed complex analytic conic subset of T^*X. For example, if $\mathcal{M}$ has a single generator u with relation $\mathcal{I}u = 0$, where $\mathcal{I}$ is a locally finitely generated ideal of $\mathcal{D}_X$, then

$$char(\mathcal{M}) = \{(z;\zeta) \in T^*X; \sigma(P)(z;\zeta) = 0 \ \forall P \in \mathcal{I}\}.$$

Using purely algebraic arguments, one deduces from (3.1):

Theorem 3.2. — $SS(Sol(\mathcal{M})) \subset char(\mathcal{M})$.

In fact, one can also prove that the inclusion above is an equality.

4. Functorial spaces

In the sixties, people used to work in various spaces of generalized functions on a real manifold. The situation drastically changed with Sato's definition of hyperfunctions by a purely cohomological way. Recall that on a real analytic manifold M of dimension n, the sheaf $\mathcal{B}_M$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{B}_M = H^n_M(\mathcal{O}_X) \otimes or_M$$

where X is a complexification of M and or_M denotes the orientation sheaf on M. Let $\mathbb{C}_{XM}$ denote the constant sheaf on M with stalk $\mathbb{C}$ extended by 0 on $X \setminus M$. By Poincaré's duality,

$$R\mathcal{H}om\,(\mathbb{C}_{XM}, \mathbb{C}_X) \simeq or_{M/X}[n]$$

where $or_{M/X} \simeq or_M$ is the (relative) orientation sheaf and $[n]$ means a shift in the derived category of sheaves. An equivalent definition of hyperfunctions is thus given by

$$\mathcal{B}_M = R\mathcal{H}om\,(D'_X\mathbb{C}_{XM}, \mathcal{O}_X) \tag{4.1}$$

where $D'_X = R\mathcal{H}om\,(\cdot, \mathbb{C}_X)$ is the duality functor.

The importance of Sato's definition is twofold: first, it is purely algebraic (starting with the analytic object $\mathcal{O}_X$), and second it highlights the link between real and complex geometry.

Let $\mathcal{A}_M$ denote the sheaf of real analytic functions on M, that is, $\mathcal{A}_M = \mathbb{C}_{XM} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X$. We have the isomorphism

$$\mathcal{A}_M \simeq R\mathcal{H}om\,(D'_X\mathbb{C}_{XM}, \mathbb{C}_X) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X,$$

from which we deduce the natural morphism

$$\mathcal{A}_M \to \mathcal{B}_M.$$

Another natural functorial space, or better sheaf of generalized holomorphic functions, is defined as follows. Consider a closed complex hypersurface Z of the complex manifold X and denote by U its complementary. Let $j : U \hookrightarrow X$ denote the embedding. Then $j_*j^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X$ represents the sheaf on X of functions holomorphic on U with possible (essential) singularities on Z. One has

$$j_*j^{-1}\mathcal{O}_X \simeq R\mathcal{H}om\,(\mathbb{C}_{XU}, \mathcal{O}_X), \tag{4.2}$$

where $\mathbb{C}_{XU}$ is the constant sheaf on U with stalk $\mathbb{C}$ extended by 0 on $X \setminus U$.

Both examples (4.1) and (4.2) are described by a sheaf of the type $R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$, with G a constant sheaf on a (real or complex) analytic subspace, extended by zero. However, this class of sheaves is not stable by the usual operations on sheaves, and it is natural to consider $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaves, that is, sheaves G such that there exists a subanalytic stratification on which G is locally constant of finite rank. Indeed, it is still better to consider G in $D^b_{\mathbb{R}-c}(\mathbb{C}_X)$, the full triangulated subcategory of $D^b(\mathbb{C}_X)$ (the bounded derived category of sheaves of $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces) consisting of objects with $\mathbb{R}$-constructible cohomology.

Hence, our functorial space is described by the complex $R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, \mathcal{O}_X)$ with $G \in D^b_{\mathbb{R}-c}(\mathbb{C}_X)$, and given a system of LPDE, that is, a coherent $\mathcal{D}_X$-module $\mathcal{M}$, the complex of generalized functions solution of this system is given by the complex

$$R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, \mathcal{O}_X)) \simeq R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)).$$

Setting $F = R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we are reduced to study the complex

$$R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, F).$$

Our only information is now purely geometrical, this is the microsupport of G and that of F (this last one being the characteristic variety of $\mathcal{M}$). Now, we can forget that we are working on a complex manifold and that we are dealing with LPDE. We are reduced to the microlocal study of sheaves on a real manifold [**4**].

Let us illustrate this point of view with two examples.

5. Application 1: ellipticity

Let us show how the classical Petrowsky regularity theorem may be obtained with the only use of the C-K-Leray Theorem 2.1, and some sheaf theory.

The regularity theorem for sheaves is as follows. Here X is a real analytic manifold, k is a field and a sheaf on X means an object of $D^b(k_X)$, the bounded derived category of sheaves of k-vector spaces on X. If M is a submanifold, we denote by T^*_MX the conormal bundle to M in X. In particular, T^*_XX denotes the zero-section, identified with X.

Theorem 5.1. — *Let F, G be two sheaves on X. Assume that G is $\mathbb{R}$-constructible and*

$$SS(G) \cap SS(F) \subset T^*_X X. \tag{5.1}$$

Then the natural morphism

$$R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, k_X) \otimes F \to R\mathcal{H}om\,(G, F) \tag{5.2}$$

is an isomorphism.

Let us come back to the situation where X is a complexification of M, and choose $k = \mathbb{C}$. Set $G = D'(\mathbb{C}_{XM})$ and $F = R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)$. A differential operator P on X is elliptic (with respect to M) if its principal symbol $\sigma(P)$ does not vanish on the conormal bundle $T^*_M X$ outside of the zero-section. More generally a coherent $\mathcal{D}_X$-module $\mathcal{M}$ is elliptic with respect to M if

$$char(\mathcal{M}) \cap T^*_M X \subset T^*_X X.$$

By Theorem 3.2

$$SS(F) \cap T^*_M X \subset T^*_X X.$$

The regularity theorem for sheaves gives the isomorphism

$$R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{A}_X) \xrightarrow{\sim} R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}_X}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}_X).$$

In other words, the two complexes of real analytic and hyperfunction solutions of an elliptic system of LPDE are quasi-isomorphic (they have the same cohomologies). This is the Petrowsky's theorem for $\mathcal{D}$-modules.

Of course, this result extends to other sheaves of generalized holomorphic functions, replacing the constant sheaf $\mathbb{C}_{XM}$ with an $\mathbb{R}$-constructible sheaf G. For further developments, see [**12**].

6. Application 2: hyperbolicity

As it is well-known since Hadamard, the Cauchy-Kowalevsky theorem does not hold any more in the real domain for general differential operators. One has to restrict ourselves to a special class of operators, called hyperbolic operators. Here again, Leray's contribution is essential [**6**].

Let us show how to treat hyperbolicity (in the weak sense) using again sheaf theory. The idea is as follows. First, and this is classical, one can reduce the Cauchy problem to a question of propagation across hypersurfaces. Then we have to estimate the directions of propagation of the sheaf of real solutions (let's say hyperfunction solutions, otherwise the general result is still unknown) of a linear differential operator, knowing its characteristic variety, that is, the set of directions of propagation of its holomorphic solutions. This is indeed a purely sheaf theoretical problem.

More precisely, consider a *real* manifold X and a submanifold M. There are natural maps

$$T^*M \hookrightarrow T^*T^*_MX \simeq T_{T^*_MX}T^*X.$$

Choosing a local coordinate system $(x, y) \in X$ with $M = \{y = 0\}$, $(x, y; \xi, \eta) \in T^*X$; $(x; \eta) \in T^*_MX$, the above isomorphism is described by

$$(x, \eta; \xi, -y) \in T^*T^*_MX \leftrightarrow (x, y; \xi, \eta) \in T_{T^*_MX}T^*X.$$

If Z is a subset of a manifold X and W is a closed submanifold of X, the Whitney normal cone $C_W(Z)$ of Z along W is a closed conic subset of the normal bundle T_WX. Hence, if S is a closed conic subset of T^*X, the Whitney normal cone $C_{T^*_MX}(S)$ of S along T^*_MX is a closed biconic (for the two actions of $\mathbb{R}^+$) subset of $T_{T^*_MX}T^*X \simeq T^*T^*_MX$.

Theorem 6.1. — *Let F complex of sheaves on X. Then*

$$SS(F|_M) \subset T^*M \cap C_{T^*_MX}(SS(F)),$$
$$SS(R\Gamma_M(F)) \subset T^*M \cap C_{T^*_MX}(SS(F)).$$

Now we assume that M is a real analytic manifold, X a complexification of M, $\mathcal{M}$ a coherent $\mathcal{D}_X$-module on X. Set $F = R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{O}_X)$.

Definition 6.2. — One says that $\theta \in T^*M$ is hyperbolic for $\mathcal{M}$ if $\theta \notin C_{T^*_MX}(char(\mathcal{M}))$.

Example 6.3. — Assume $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{D}_X/\mathcal{D}_X \cdot P$. Then θ is hyperbolic if and only if

$$\sigma(P)(x; \sqrt{-1}\eta + \theta) \neq 0 \text{ for } (x; \eta) \in T^*_MX.$$

Applying Theorems 6.1 and 3.2, we get

Theorem 6.4. — *The microsupport $SS(R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}_M))$ of the complex of hyperfunction solutions of $\mathcal{M}$ is contained in the normal cone of $char(\mathcal{M})$ along T^*_MX:*

$$SS(R\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{M}, \mathcal{B}_M)) \subset C_{T^*_MX}(char(\mathcal{M})).$$

In other words, one has propagation in the hyperbolic directions.

The same result holds with $\mathcal{B}_M$ replaced with $\mathcal{A}_M$.

One easily deduces from this result that the Cauchy problem is well-posed for hyperbolic systems in the space of hyperfunctions.

7. From classical sheaves to Grothendieck topologies

Let M be a real analytic manifold. The usual topology on M does not allow one to treat usual spaces of analysis with the tools of sheaf theory. For example, the property of being temperate is not local, and there is no sheaf of temperate distributions. One way to overcome this difficulty is to introduce a Grothendieck topology on M. Recall that a Grothendieck topology is not a topology, and in fact is not defined on a space but on a category. The objects of the category playing the role of the open subsets of the space, it is an axiomatization of the notion of a covering. A site is a category endowed with a Grothendieck topology.

We denote by Op_M the category whose objects are the open subsets of M and the morphisms are the inclusions of open subsets. One defines a Grothendieck topology on Op_M by deciding that a family $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ of subobjects of $U \in \mathrm{Op}_M$ is a covering of U if it is a covering in the usual sense.

We denote by $\mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$ the full subcategory of Op_M consisting of subanalytic and relatively compact open subsets. We define a Grothendieck topology on $\mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$ by deciding that a family $\{U_i\}_{i\in I}$ of subobjects of $U \in \mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$ is a covering of U if there exists a finite subset $J \subset I$ such that $\bigcup_{j\in J} U_j = U$. We denote by M_{sa} the site so obtained.

We shall denote by

$$\rho : M \to M_{sa} \tag{7.1}$$

the natural morphism of sites associated with the embedding $\mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Op}_M$.

Definition 7.1. — Let $U \in \mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$. We say that U is regular if for each $x \in M$, there exists an open neighborhood V of x and a topological isomorphism $\phi : V \xrightarrow{\sim} W$ where W is open in some vector space E and $\phi(U \cap V)$ is convex in E.

If $U \in \mathrm{Op}_M$, we denote by $\overline{U}$ the closure of U in M. Note that if U is regular, the dual of the constant sheaf on U is the constant sheaf on $\overline{U}$. In other words,

$$D'_M \mathbb{C}_{MU} \simeq \mathbb{C}_{M\overline{U}}.$$

Let us denote by $\mathcal{C}^\infty_M$ the sheaf of rings of complex valued $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-functions on M. Note that if U is regular, the space $\Gamma_{M\setminus U}(M;\mathcal{C}^\infty_M)$ of $\mathcal{C}^\infty$-functions on M with support in $M \setminus U$ coincides with the space of functions which vanish with all their derivatives on $\overline{U}$.

Proposition/Définition 7.2. — (i) *There exists a unique sheaf $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\omega}_{M_{sa}}$ on M_{sa} such that $\Gamma(U;\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\omega}_{M_{sa}}) \simeq \mathcal{C}^\infty_M(\overline{U})$ for $U \in \mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$, U regular.*

(ii) *There exists a unique sheaf $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\mathrm{w}}_{M_{sa}}$ on M_{sa} such that*

$$\Gamma(U;\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\mathrm{w}}_{M_{sa}}) \simeq \Gamma(M;\mathcal{C}^\infty_M)/\Gamma_{M\setminus U}(M;\mathcal{C}^\infty_M)$$

for $U \in \mathrm{Op}_{M_{sa}}$, U regular.

Definition 7.3. — Let $f \in \mathcal{C}^\infty_M(U)$. One says that f has *polynomial growth* at $p \in M$ if it satisfies the following condition. For a local coordinate system $(x_1,\dots,x_n)$ around p, there exist a sufficiently small compact neighborhood K of p and a positive integer N such that

$$\sup_{x\in K\cap U} \big(\mathrm{dist}(x, K\setminus U)\big)^N |f(x)| < \infty\,. \tag{7.2}$$

It is obvious that f has polynomial growth at any point of U. We say that f is temperate at p if all its derivatives have polynomial growth at p. We say that f is temperate if it is temperate at any point.

For an open subanalytic subset U of M, denote by $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_M(U)$ the subspace of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}_M(U)$ consisting of temperate functions. Denote by $\mathcal{D}b_M$ the sheaf of complex valued distributions on M and, for Z a closed subset of M, by $\Gamma_Z(\mathcal{D}b_M)$ the subsheaf of sections supported by Z.

Definition 7.4. — (i) One denotes by $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_M$ the presheaf $U \mapsto \mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_M(U)$ on M_{sa}.
(ii) One denotes by $\mathcal{D}b^{temp}_{M_{sa}}$ the presheaf $U \mapsto \Gamma(M; Db_M)/\Gamma_{M\setminus U}(M; \mathcal{D}b_M)$ on M_{sa}.

Proposition 7.5. — (i) *The presheaf* $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_{M_{sa}}$ *is a sheaf on* M_{sa}.
(ii) *The presheaf* $\mathcal{D}b^{temp}_{M_{sa}}$ *is a flabby sheaf on* M_{sa}.

One calls $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\mathrm{w}}_{M_{sa}}$ the sheaf of Whitney functions on M_{sa}, $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_{M_{sa}}$ the sheaf of temperate functions on M_{sa}, and $\mathcal{D}b^{temp}_{M_{sa}}$ the sheaf of temperate distributions on M_{sa}. For more details on these sheaves, refer to [**5**].

Note that Propositions 7.2 and 7.5 follow from Lojasiewicz's inequalities [**8**], (see also [**9**]).

Finally, denote by $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}_{M_{sa}}$ the image by ρ_* of the sheaf $\mathcal{C}^{\infty}_M$. We get monomorphims of sheaves on M_{sa}

$$\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\omega}_{M_{sa}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\infty,\mathrm{w}}_{M_{sa}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\infty,t}_{M_{sa}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{C}^{\infty}_{M_{sa}}. \tag{7.3}$$

Now let X be a complex manifold and denote by $\overline{X}$ the complex conjugate manifold. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$ denotes the Cauchy-Riemann system on the real underlying manifold.

For $\lambda = \omega, \mathrm{w}, t, \emptyset$, one defines the objects $\mathcal{O}^{\lambda}_{X_{sa}} \in D^b(\beta\mathcal{D}_{X_{sa}})$ by the formula

$$\mathcal{O}^{\lambda}_{X_{sa}} = R\mathcal{H}om_{\beta\mathcal{D}_{\overline{X}_{\mathrm{sa}}}}(\beta\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}_{\mathrm{sa}}}, \mathcal{C}^{\infty,\lambda}_{X_{sa}}),$$

where $\beta\mathcal{O}_{X_{sa}}$ is the sheaf on X_{sa} associated with the presheaf $U \mapsto \mathcal{O}(\overline{U})$ and similarly with $\beta\mathcal{D}_{X_{sa}}$. In other words, $\mathcal{O}^{\lambda}_{X_{sa}}$ is the Dolbeault complex of $\mathcal{C}^{\infty,\lambda}_{X_{sa}}$.

We have a chain of morphisms in $D^b(\beta\mathcal{D}_{X_{sa}})$

$$\mathcal{O}^{\omega}_{X_{sa}} \to \mathcal{O}^{\mathrm{w}}_{X_{sa}} \to \mathcal{O}^{t}_{X_{sa}} \to \mathcal{O}_{X_{sa}}.$$

One can recover the sheaf of temperate distributions on M_{sa} by mimicking Sato's construction of hyperfunctions given in (4.1).

Theorem 7.6. — *There is a natural isomorphism of sheaves on* M_{sa}

$$\mathcal{D}b^{temp}_{M_{sa}} \simeq R\mathcal{IH}om\,(D'_X\mathbb{C}_{XM}, \mathcal{O}^t_{X_{sa}}).$$

(Here, $R\mathcal{IH}om$ *denotes the derived internal Hom in the category of sheaves on the site* X_{sa}*.)*

One recovers the usual sheaf of distributions $\mathcal{D}b_M$ on M by the formula

$$\mathcal{D}b_M \simeq \rho^{-1}\mathcal{D}b^{temp}_{M_{sa}}, \tag{7.4}$$

where ρ is given by (7.1).

Hence, we have obtained an algebraic and functorial construction of Schwartz's distributions, starting with C^∞-functions. This is an illustration of the strength of sheaf theory, a theory invented by Leray and revisited by Grothendieck.

References

[1] M. Artin, A. Grothendieck & J.-L. Verdier – Théorie des topos et cohomologie étale des schémas, *Sém. Géom. Algébrique (1963-64)*, Lecture Notes in Math., no. 269, 270, 305, Springer, Berlin, 1972, 1973.

[2] L. Hörmander – *The analysis of linear partial differential operators*, Grundlehren der Math. Wiss., no. 256, Springer-Verlag, 1983.

[3] M. Kashiwara – *D-modules and microlocal calculus*, Translations of Mathematical Monographs, no. 217, American Math. Soc., 2003.

[4] M. Kashiwara & P. Schapira – *Sheaves on manifolds*, Grundlehren der Math. Wiss, no. 292, Springer-Verlag, 1990.

[5] ———, *Ind-sheaves*, Astérisque, no. 271, Soc. Mathématique de France, 2001.

[6] J. Leray – *Hyperbolic differential equations*, The Institute for Advanced Study, 1953, Princeton mimeographed notes.

[7] ———, *Scientific work*, Springer-Verlag & Soc. Mathématique de France, 1997.

[8] S. Lojaciewicz – Sur le problème de la division, *Studia Math.* **8** (1961), p. 87–156.

[9] B. Malgrange – *Ideals of differentialble functions*, TIFR, Bombay, Oxford Univ. Press, 1966.

[10] M. Sato – Theory of hyperfunctions II, *Journ. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo,* **8** (1960), p. 387–437.

[11] M. Sato, T. Kawai & M. Kashiwara – Microfunctions and pseudo-differential equations, *Hyperfunctions and pseudo-differential equations* (Springer-Verlag, ed.), Lecture Notes in Math., no. 287, Proceedings Katata 1971, 1973, p. 265–529.

[12] P. Schapira & J.-P. Schneiders – *Index theorem for elliptic pairs*, Astérisque, no. 224, Soc. Mathématique de France, 1994.

[13] M. Zerner – Domaine d'holomorphie des équations vérifiant une équation aux dérivées partielles, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **272** (1971), p. 1646–1648.

Pierre Schapira, Institut de Mathématiques, Université Pierre et Marie Curie, 175, rue de Chevaleret, 75013 Paris, France • *E-mail :* schapira@math.jussieu.fr
Url : www.math.jussieu.fr/~schapira/