

Superstrings in the geometrical approach and constrained super-WZNW models*

Dedicated to the memory of Dmitriy V. Volkov and Victor I. Ogievetskii

Dmitri Sorokin

*INFN, Sezione di Padova, via Marzolo, 8, 35131 Padova, Italia and
Kharkov Institute of Physics and Technology, Kharkov, Ukraine*

Abstract

By use of geometrical methods of surface theory we demonstrate links of Green-Schwarz superstring dynamics with supersymmetric exactly-solvable nonlinear systems and super-WZNW models reduced in an appropriate way.

This talk is based on recent results obtained in collaboration with I. Bandos, P. Pasti, M. Tonin and D. Volkov [1, 2], and F. Toppan [3] in studying classical dynamics of supersymmetric extended objects in a geometrical (twistor-like) approach (see [1] for references), which is based on following principles:

- i) the fermionic κ -symmetry of the Green-Schwarz formulation of super-p-branes is a manifestation of superdiffeomorphisms of worldvolume supersurfaces of the super-p-branes [4]. (This solves the problem of infinite reducibility of the κ -symmetry and makes it possible to carry out covariant Hamiltonian analysis of superstring dynamics at least on the classical level);
- ii) the geometrical ground for this is that the theory of super-p-branes is supposed to be a particular kind of doubly supersymmetric models (studied earlier in [5]) which describe an embedding of supersurfaces into target superspaces. (This naturally incorporates twistors into the theory).

One of the aims of the approach has been to push forward the problem of covariant quantization of superstring theory. As a result the methods to attain this objective have undergone substantial modifications during last few years (see [6] for a recent review).

At the same time new directions have been revealed where the doubly supersymmetric formulation can be used. For instance, it can serve as a natural dynamical basis for generalizing geometrical methods and notions of classical surface theory (which have been

*Based on talks given at the INTAS Network Workshop on “Fundamental Problems in Classical, Quantum and String Gravity” (Torino, 2-3 May, 1996), The International Conference on “Problems of Quantum Field Theory” (Alushta, 13-18 May, 1996) and The Second International Sakharov Conference on Physics (Moscow, 20-24 May, 1996).

used in bosonic string theory [7]) to study the embedding of at least a particular class of supersurfaces corresponding to super-p-branes, and then to apply the geometrical methods back to the analysis of variety of fundamental and solitonic super-p-branes we are having at hand. (Supergravity as a theory of supersurfaces was considered previously in [8]).

Recent results in this direction [1] have revealed links of Green-Schwarz superstring dynamics with a nonstandard version of the super-Liouville system [2] and with super-WZNW models subject to a nonstandard Hamiltonian reduction [3]. Through this WZNW connection we have arrived at a superconformal model related to a universal string theory describing a hierarchy of superstrings embedded one into another [9].

The main part of this report is devoted to the discussion of these points by use of the example of a Green-Schwarz superstring propagating in $N = 2$, $D = 3$ flat superspace.

We shall see how by specifying the embedding of worldsheet supersurface swept by the superstring one can solve for the Virasoro constraints and reduce superstring equations of motion to a supersymmetric Liouville-like system of equations.

In the doubly supersymmetric formulation worldsheet of the Green-Schwarz superstrings is a supersurface parametrized by two bosonic coordinates $\xi^m = (\tau + \sigma, \tau - \sigma)$, $m = (++, --)$ and fermionic coordinates η whose number to be equal to the number of independent κ -symmetry transformations in the standard Green-Schwarz formulation. In our case there are one left- and one right-handed Majorana-Weyl spinor coordinates, which means that we deal with $n = (1, 1)$ local supersymmetry on worldsheet supersurface

$$\mathcal{M}_{ws} : \quad Z = (\xi^m, \eta^+, \eta^-), \quad (1)$$

where $+$ and $-$ stand for light-cone spinor indices of $SO(1, 1)$.

To describe $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ geometry one should set on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ a local frame of supervielbein one-forms which contains two bosonic vector and two fermionic spinor components

$$e^A(Z) = (e^a(Z), e^+(Z), e^-(Z)), \quad a = (++, --). \quad (2)$$

We consider an embedding of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ into $N = 2$, $D = 3$ flat superspace-time parametrized by three bosonic vector and two Majorana spinor coordinates $X^{\underline{m}}(Z)$, $\Theta^{1\underline{\mu}}(Z)$, $\Theta^{2\underline{\mu}}(Z)$, where $\underline{m} = 0, 1, 2$ and $\underline{\mu} = 1, 2$ are vector and spinor indices of the $D = 3$ Lorentz group $SO(1, 2)$, respectively.

A natural supersymmetric rigid frame in flat target superspace is

$$\Pi^{\underline{m}} = dX^{\underline{m}} - i\bar{\Theta}^i \Gamma^{\underline{m}} d\Theta^i, \quad d\Theta^{i\underline{\mu}} \quad (i = 1, 2). \quad (3)$$

$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta}^{\underline{m}}$ are $D = 3$ Dirac matrices.

The study of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ embedding is started with fitting the rigid target-superspace frame (3) to that on the supersurface (2). To this end we transform (3) into a new local frame

$$E^{\underline{a}} = \Pi^{\underline{m}} u_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}(X, \Theta), \quad E^{i\underline{\alpha}} = d\Theta^{i\underline{\mu}} v_{\underline{\mu}}^{\underline{\alpha}}(X, \Theta), \quad (4)$$

where $u_{\underline{m}}^{\underline{a}}$ and $v_{\underline{\mu}}^{\underline{\alpha}}$ are matrices of the vector and spinor representation of the target-superspace Lorentz group $SO(1, 2)$, respectively. But since the vector and spinor components of (3) are subject to the Lorentz transformation simultaneously, u and v are

not independent and connected through the well-know twistor-like relation $u_{\underline{m}}^a(\Gamma^{\underline{m}})_{\underline{\mu}\underline{\nu}} = v_{\underline{\mu}}^{\underline{a}}(\Gamma^{\underline{a}})_{\underline{\alpha}\underline{\beta}}v_{\underline{\nu}}^{\underline{\beta}}$ between vectors and commuting spinors. This explains why the approach is called “twistor-like”.

From the analysis of superstring dynamics in the twistor-like approach we learn [1] that the target-superspace local frame (4) can be attached to the supersurface as follows:

$$E^\perp(Z) = 0, \quad E^a(Z) = \Pi^{\underline{m}}u_{\underline{m}}^a = (dX^{\underline{m}} - i\bar{\Theta}^i\Gamma^{\underline{m}}\Theta^i)u_{\underline{m}}^a = e^a, \quad (5)$$

$$E^{1+}(Z) = d\Theta^{1\mu}v_{\underline{\mu}}^+ = e^+, \quad E^{2-}(Z) = d\Theta^{2\mu}v_{\underline{\mu}}^- = e^-, \quad (6)$$

where the target superspace indices split onto that of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ and of the orthogonal vector direction ($\underline{a} \rightarrow (a, \perp)$; $\underline{\alpha} \rightarrow (+, -)$).

Eq. (5) tells us that one of the vector components of the target superspace frame can be made orthogonal to the supersurface (its pullback on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ is zero) and three other relations in (5), (6) identify (on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$) components of the target superspace frame with the intrinsic $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ supervielbein components (2).

From (5), (6), using the orthogonality properties of $u_{\underline{m}}^a$, we find that the pullback on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ of the vector one-superform $\Pi^{\underline{m}}(Z) = dX^{\underline{m}} - i\bar{\Theta}^i\Gamma^{\underline{m}}d\Theta^i = e^au_{\underline{a}}^{\underline{m}}(Z)$ is zero along the fermionic directions $e^\pm$ of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$:

$$D_\pm X^{\underline{m}} - i\bar{\Theta}^i\Gamma^{\underline{m}}D_\pm\Theta^i = 0, \quad (7)$$

where $D_\pm$ are covariant spinor derivatives on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$. Eq. (7) is called the geometrodynamical condition. Eqs. (5) guarantee that the Virasoro constraints on superstring dynamics

$$\Pi_{++}^{\underline{m}}\Pi_{++}^{\underline{m}} = 0 = \Pi_{--}^{\underline{m}}\Pi_{--}^{\underline{m}} \quad (8)$$

are identically satisfied for such kind of embedding [1].

One can notice that Eqs. (5), (6) are first-order differential equations on $X(Z)$ and $\Theta(Z)$. If they are solved one would know the shape of the worldsheet supersurface in $D = 3$, $N = 2$ superspace and thus would solve the problem of describing classical superstring motion. To solve (5) and (6) one must know $v_{\underline{\mu}}^{\underline{a}}(Z)$ and the components of $e^a(Z)$, $e^\pm(Z)$. To get this information one should study the integrability conditions of (5), (6) which are obtained by taking the external differential of (5), (6). Basic integrability conditions thus obtained are:

$$de^a - \Omega_b^a e^b = ie^\alpha \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a e^\beta = T^a, \quad (9)$$

$$\Omega^{\perp a} = K_b^a e^b + K_\alpha^a e^\alpha, \quad (10)$$

where $\alpha = (+, -)$, $\gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a$ are d=2 Dirac matrices, and external differentiation and product of the forms are implied. Eqs. (9), (10) contain one forms Ω_b^a , $\Omega^{\perp a}$ which are Cartan forms of the $SO(1, 2)$ Lorentz group constructed out of the matrix $v_{\underline{\mu}}^{\underline{a}}$ components:

$$\Omega^{ab} = \epsilon^{ab}v_{\underline{\mu}}^+ dv^{-\underline{\mu}}, \quad \Omega^{\perp a} = \gamma_{\alpha\beta}^a v_{\underline{\mu}}^\alpha dv^{\beta\underline{\mu}}. \quad (11)$$

Eq. (9) determines parallel transport of vector supervielbeins along $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ carried out by induced connection Ω^{ab} . It reads that the connection possesses torsion whose spinor–spinor components are constrained to be equal to the γ –matrix components. This is a basic torsion constraint of any supergravity theory. In the geometrical approach it is not imposed by hand, but appears as a consistency condition of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ embedding.

The second condition (10) specifies the expansion of $\Omega^{\perp a}$ in the $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ supervielbein components: the bosonic matrix $K_{ab}(Z)$ is symmetric and has the properties of the second fundamental form analogous to that of the bosonic surfaces, while spinor components $K^\alpha(Z) \equiv K_\beta^a \gamma_a^{\beta\alpha}$ of the Grassmann–odd spin–tensor K_β^a can be associated with a fermionic counterpart of the second fundamental form along Grassmann directions of the supersurface.

By construction the Cartan forms (11) must satisfy the $SO(1, 2)$ Maurer–Cartan equations $d\Omega - \Omega\Omega = 0$ which split into two systems of equations with respect to the world–sheet indices:

$$d\Omega^{\perp a} - \Omega_b^a \Omega^{\perp b} = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$R^{ab} = d\Omega^{ab} = \Omega^{\perp a} \Omega^{\perp b}. \quad (13)$$

Eq. (12) is known as the Codazzi equation and (13) is called the Gauss equation in surface theory. On the other hand one can recognize in (12) and (13) relations which specify geometry on a two–dimensional coset space $\frac{SO(1,2)}{SO(1,1)}$ with $\Omega^{\perp a}$ being a vielbein, Ω^{ab} being a spin connection and R^{ab} being a constant curvature tensor of $\frac{SO(1,2)}{SO(1,1)}$.

Thus we have reduced the problem of studying superstring dynamics (as the embedding of a supersurface into target superspace) to study a mapping of $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$ onto the bosonic coset space of constant curvature. It is here that a connection of Green–Schwarz superstring dynamics with an $n = (1, 1)$ super–WZNW model comes out.

To completely describe superstring dynamics in geometrical terms we should specify what additional conditions on embedding arise when the superstring equations of motion are taken into account. In bosonic surface theory such an embedding is called minimal and is characterized by traceless second fundamental form K_{ab} :

$$K_a^a = 0. \quad (14)$$

In the supersymmetric case we get analogous condition on the bosonic part of the second fundamental form (10) which is in one to one correspondence with $X^{\underline{m}}$ equations of motion $D_a \left(D^a X^{\underline{m}} - i \bar{\Theta}^i \Gamma^{\underline{m}} D^a \Theta^i \right) u_m^\perp = 0$ (where $D_a = (D_{--}, D_{++})$ is a vector covariant derivative). In addition, $\Theta(z)$ equations of motion, which in the twistor–like approach have the form $D_{--} \Theta^{1\mu} v_\mu^- = 0$, $D_{++} \Theta^{2\mu} v_\mu^+ = 0$, result in vanishing the fermionic part of the second fundamental form in Eq. (10), namely

$$K^\alpha(Z) \equiv K_\beta^a \gamma_{a\beta}^\alpha = 0. \quad (15)$$

The minimal embedding conditions (14), (15) further reduce the number of independent superfields which determine the induced geometry on $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$. One can show that in a superconformal gauge $\Omega^{\perp a}$ and Ω^{ab} (which bear all information about $\mathcal{M}_{ws}$) depend only

on three superfields, one bosonic superfield $\Phi(Z)$ and two fermionic superfields $\Psi_+(Z)$ and $\bar{\Psi}_-(Z)$, whose leading components describe one bosonic and two fermionic physical degrees of freedom of the classical N=2, D=3 Green–Schwarz superstring.

The superfields obey $n = (1, 1)$ superconformal invariant equations which follow from (12) and (13).

$$D_+\Psi_+ = 0, \quad D_-\bar{\Psi}_- = 0, \quad (\text{anti})\text{chirality conditions} \quad (16)$$

$$D_+D_-\Phi = e^{2\Phi}\bar{\Psi}_-\Psi_+ \quad \text{Liouville – like equation} \quad (17)$$

$$D_-\Psi_+ + 2D_-\Phi\Psi_+ = 1, \quad D_+\bar{\Psi}_- + 2D_+\Phi\bar{\Psi}_- = 1, \quad \text{“constraints”}. \quad (18)$$

Let us compare the system (16)–(18) with the standard super–Liouville equation

$$D_+D_-\tilde{\Phi} = -ie^{\tilde{\Phi}}, \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{\Phi}(Z) = \tilde{\phi} + i\eta^+\tilde{\psi}_+ + i\eta^-\tilde{\psi}_- + i\eta^+\eta^-F$ is an unconstrained bosonic superfield and D_-, D_+ are covariant spinor derivatives ($D_-^2 = i\partial_{--}$, $D_+^2 = i\partial_{++}$).

Recently Ivanov, Krivonos and Pashnev found relations (local Bäcklund transformations) which express the component fields of the standard super–Liouville system in terms of the components of the alternative one.² They can be packed into the following superfield expression, which has the form of expansion of $\tilde{\Phi}(Z)$ in series of $\bar{\Psi}_-(Z), \Psi_+(Z)$:

$$\tilde{\Phi}(Z) = \Phi(Z) + D_+\Phi\bar{\Psi}_-(Z) + D_-\Phi\Psi_+(Z) + ie^{\Phi}\bar{\Psi}_-(Z)\Psi_+(Z). \quad (20)$$

In spite of this relation two super–Liouville systems possess different properties. For instance, in components (16)–(18) reduce to the purely bosonic Liouville equation and two free chiral fermion equations

$$\partial_{++}\partial_{--}\phi(\xi) = -e^{2\phi}, \quad \partial_{++}\psi_+ = 0 = \partial_{--}\psi_-, \quad (21)$$

while the standard super–Liouville system (19) is characterized by nontrivial coupling between the boson and the fermions

$$\partial_{++}\partial_{--}\tilde{\phi} = -e^{\tilde{\phi}}(e^{\tilde{\phi}} + i\tilde{\psi}_-\tilde{\psi}_+), \quad \partial_{++}\tilde{\psi}_- = -e^{\tilde{\phi}}\tilde{\psi}_+, \quad \partial_{--}\tilde{\psi}_+ = e^{\tilde{\phi}}\tilde{\psi}_-. \quad (22)$$

The supersymmetry transformation properties of ψ_+, ψ_- are ($\delta\eta_- = \epsilon_-(\xi^{++})$, $\delta\eta_+ = \epsilon_+(\xi^{--})$):

$$\delta\psi_+ = \epsilon_+(1 + i\psi_+\partial_{--}\psi_+), \quad \delta\psi_- = \epsilon_-(1 + i\psi_-\partial_{++}\psi_-). \quad (23)$$

We see that the fermionic fields transform as Goldstone fermions [10] which points to the spontaneous breaking of the superconformal symmetry in contrast to the standard super–Liouville system.

Another difference from the standard super–Liouville fermions is that ψ_+ and ψ_- have conformal spin $(-\frac{1}{2})$ (unusual for matter fields), while the former have conformal spin $\frac{1}{2}$.

²However, it seems not possible to locally express the fields of (16)–(18) in terms of $\tilde{\Phi}(Z)$ components because of derivatives in the r.h.s. of (20).

In [3] it was shown that ψ_+ and ψ_- together with their momenta belong to a ghost-like $b - c$ system of conformal spin $(\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})$ which one encounters with in universal string theory [9]. It seems of interest that in our case such a system arose as one describing the classical physical degrees of freedom of a conventional $N = 2$, $D = 3$ Green-Schwarz superstring.

The reason why the alternative and not the standard super-Liouville system of equations was obtained in the case of the free $N = 2$, $D = 3$ Green-Schwarz superstring is because of their another difference: the underlying group of the standard $n = (1, 1)$ super-Liouville equation is the supergroup $OSp(1|2)$ while that of the alternative system is $SL(2, \mathbf{R}) \sim SO(1, 2)$, as we have seen above. But since there is the relation (20) between the two systems one may argue that on the mass shell the $N = 2$, $D = 3$ Green-Schwarz superstring possesses hidden $OSp(1|2)$ symmetry.

By the statement about the underlying groups I mean that the standard super-Liouville model can be obtained by a Hamiltonian reduction of an $n = (1, 1)$ super-WZNW model based on $OSp(1|2)$ [13], while the system (16)–(18) arises in an appropriately constrained super-WZNW model based on $SL(2, \mathbf{R})$ [3]. Let us briefly sketch this point.

The equations of motion of the super-WZNW models [11, 13] are (anti)chirality conditions on fermionic supercurrents taking their values in the algebra of a (super)group $G(Z)$:

$$D_+(\frac{1}{i}D_-GG^{-1}) \equiv D_+\hat{\Psi}_- = 0, \quad D_-(\frac{1}{i}D_+G^{-1}G) \equiv D_-\hat{\hat{\Psi}}_+ = 0. \quad (24)$$

We see that $\hat{\Psi}_-(Z)$ and $\hat{\hat{\Psi}}_+(Z)$ are the fermionic components of Cartan forms on G (like in the consideration above). When $G = OSp(1|2)$ they have the following expansion in $OSp(1|2)$ generators:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Psi}_- &= \Psi_-H + \Psi_+E_{--} + \Psi_{---}E_{++} + \Psi F_- + \Psi_{--}F_+, \\ \hat{\hat{\Psi}}_+ &= \bar{\Psi}_+H + \bar{\Psi}_{+++}E_{--} + \bar{\Psi}_-E_{++} + \bar{\Psi}_{++}F_- + \bar{\Psi}F_+, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where H, E_{++}, E_{--} are the bosonic generators of the $Sl(2, \mathbf{R})$ subgroup and F_+, F_- are fermionic generators of $OSp(1|2)$. Pluses and minuses stand for charges of the quantities with respect to the Cartan subalgebra H of $OSp(1|2)$.

To get super-Liouville equations from (24), one should first identify a superfield $\Phi(Z)$ which will describe the Liouville modes. For that one takes the Gauss decomposition of the group element

$$G = g_+e^{\Phi H}g_-, \quad (26)$$

where $g_+(Z)$ and $g_-(Z)$ are generated by (E_{++}, F_+) and (E_{--}, F_-) , respectively.

Then one should perform a Hamiltonian reduction procedure [12] by imposing constraints on components of (25) as follows:

$$\bar{\Psi} = 1, \quad \bar{\Psi}_- = 0; \quad \Psi = 1, \quad \Psi_+ = 0. \quad (27)$$

Note that $\Psi, \bar{\Psi}$ are bosonic superfields (see (25)), so they can be constrained to be nonzero constants, while $\Psi_+, \bar{\Psi}_-$ are fermionic superfields. Such a reduction of supercurrent components (25) and Eqs. (24) results in the standard super-Liouville equation (22).

If $G = Sl(2, \mathbf{R})$ then all supercurrents corresponding to F_+, F_- in (25) are identically zero and we remain only with $Sl(2, \mathbf{R})$ supercurrent components which are fermionic.

So, it turns out that now, to get the alternative super-Liouville system (16)–(18) one should first construct bosonic supercurrents out of the fermionic ones using the Maurer–Cartan equations on the superforms dGG^{-1} and $G^{-1}dG$ and then impose constraints on their E_{++}, E_{--} components [3]:

$$\begin{aligned} J &\equiv tr(\partial_{--}GG^{-1}E_{++}) = D_- \Psi_+ + 2i\Psi_- \Psi_+ = 1, \\ \bar{J} &\equiv tr(G^{-1}\partial_{++}GE_{--}) = D_+ \bar{\Psi}_- + 2i\bar{\Psi}_+ \bar{\Psi}_- = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

In (28) one can recognize (18), while (16) and (17) follow from (24).

To conclude, let us sum up what we have learned from the consideration above.

The doubly supersymmetric formulation of super-p-branes allows one to generalize methods of surface theory, to apply the geometrical approach to study the dynamics of supersymmetric extended objects and to reduce their equations of motion to nonlinear supersymmetric systems of equations on their physical modes. such as the alternative version of the super-Liouville system in the case of the $N = 2, D = 3$ Green–Schwarz superstring. The generalization of these results to higher-dimensional and curved supergravity backgrounds might be useful for studying problems of superstring cosmology (see [14] and refs. therein), and super-p-branes in superstring theory, M- and F-theory.

We have also observed a connection of superstring dynamics with a constrained super-WZNW model. This is in accordance with a well known fact that WZNW models have deep relationship with string theory. A new point we encountered with is that to constrain the $n = 1$ $Sl(2, \mathbf{R})$ super-WZNW model in the appropriate way we had to impose the nonlinear constraints (28) on basic fermionic supercurrents, which turn out to be a mixture of first- and second-class constraints [3]. Usually one deals with linear first-class constraints like Eqs. (27). Such a generalization of the Hamiltonian reduction procedure allows one to involve into the game wider class of super-WZNW models and corresponding affine (super)algebras which contain bosonic simple roots in any root decomposition as, for example, $OSp(1|4)$. This way one may hope to get new supersymmetric versions of Toda-like systems with nonlinearly realized supersymmetry and nonstandard realizations of corresponding W -algebras.

This work was partially supported by the State Committee for Science and Technology of Ukraine under the Grant N 2/100 and by the INTAS grant 93–493.

References

- [1] I. Bandos, P. Pasti, D. Sorokin, M. Tonin and D. Volkov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B446** (1995) 79 (and references therein).

- [2] I. Bandos, D. Sorokin and D. Volkov, *Phys. Lett.* **B372** (1996) 77 (hep-th/9510220).
- [3] D. Sorokin and F. Toppan, Preprint DFPD 96/TH/15, hep-th/9603187.
- [4] D. Sorokin, V. Tkach and D. Volkov, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 4** (1989) 901.
- [5] S. J. Gates Jr. and H. Nishino, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) 391. J. Kowalski-Glikman, *Phys. Lett.* **B180** (1986) 358. R. Brooks, F. Muhammed and S. J. Gates Jr. *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** (1986) 745. J. Kowalski-Glikman, J. W. van Holten, S. Aoyama and J. Lukierski, *Phys. Lett.* **B201** (1987) 487. A. Kavalov and R. L. Mkrtchyan, Preprint Yer.PhI 1068(31)-88, Yerevan, 1988 (unpublished).
- [6] N. Berkovits, Preprint IFUSP-P-1212, April 1996, hep-th/9604123.
- [7] F. Lund and T. Regge, *Phys. Rev.* **D 14** (1976) 1524. R. Omnes, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 149** (1979) 269. B. M. Barbashov and V. V. Nesterenko, *Introduction to the relativistic string theory* World Scientific, Singapore, 1990 (and references therein).
- [8] V. I. Ogievetskii and E. S. Sokatchev, *Phys. Lett.* **B 79** (1978) 222; *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. (Yadern.Fiz.)* **28** (1978) 1631, *Ibid.* **31** (1980) 264, 821. A. S. Schwarz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **87** (1982) 37; A. A. Roslyi and A. S. Schwarz, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **95** (1984) 161; *Commun. Math. Phys.* **96** (1984) 285.
- [9] N. Berkovits and C. Vafa, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A 9** (1993) 653. N. Berkovits and N. Ohta, *Phys. Lett.* **B 334** (1994) 72. F. Bastianelli, *Phys. Lett.* **B 332** (1994) 340.
- [10] D. V. Volkov and V. P. Akulov, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **16** (1972) 438, *Phys. Lett.* **B 46** (1973) 109. D. V. Volkov and V. A. Soroka, *Sov. Phys. JETP Lett.* **18** (1973) 312.
- [11] S. P. Novikov, *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **37** (1982) 3. E. Witten, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **92** (1984) 83.
- [12] L. Fehér et. al. L. O’Raifeartaigh, P. Ruelle, I. Tsutsui and A. Wipf, *Phys. Reports* **222** (1992) 1.
- [13] F. Delduc, E. Ragoucy and P. Sorba, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **146** (1992) 403.
- [14] N. Sánchez and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 333** (1990) 253; M. Gasperini, N. Sánchez and G. Veneziano, *Nucl. Phys.* **B 364** (1991) 365; A. L. Larsen and N. Sánchez, hep-th/9603049.