To summarize the situation from last time, we had state-spaces & constraints as follows in quantum theory

$$\begin{array}{c} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{open} = L^{2}(\Pi^{U,D-1}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{closed} = L^{2}(\Pi^{U,D-1}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{closed} = \sum_{i=1}^{2} (\Pi^{U,D-1}) \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{Foch} = \operatorname{Span} \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^{K} \alpha_{-n_{i}}^{M_{i}} | 0 \right\} \right\} = \left\{ \bigoplus_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{Fock} \left[N \right] \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{m} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{K=-m}^{\infty} \alpha_{m-K} \otimes \alpha_{K} \right\} \\ \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{o} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{o} \otimes \alpha_{o} + \sum_{K=1}^{\infty} \alpha_{-K} \otimes \alpha_{K} \right\} = \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{o} \otimes \alpha_{o} + N \right\}$$
 (idem for L 's.)

The algebra of the {Ln} operators in the quantum theory are modified

$$\rightarrow \left[L_{m, L_{n}} \right]^{=} (m-n) L_{m+n} + \frac{D}{12} (m^{2}-m) S_{m+n, 0} \\ \rightarrow \left(\left[L_{m, L_{n}} \right]^{=} (m-n) L_{m+n} + \frac{C}{12} (m^{2}-m) S_{m+n, 0} \right) \qquad \left(V_{irascro} algebra d'central charge "C" \right)$$

Due to central term, con't impose vanishing et all Lm's on physical states; use "Gupta-Bleuler"-like method: normal ordering constant $\mathcal{U}_{phys} = \begin{bmatrix} m \\ \bigcap_{k=1}^{m} Ker(L_k) \end{bmatrix} \cap Kor(L_o - a)$

For a state at a given level, only need to check a finite # of constraints because Lm's lower level by M (for m>G), and there are no negative-level states:

$$[N, L_m] = -mL_m \implies L_m : \mathcal{U}_{Fock}[N] \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{Fock}[N-m]$$

In fact, the situation is simpler still: $[L_{+2}, L_{+1}] = L_{+3}$ $[L_{+2}, L_{+2}] = L_{+3}$ $[L_{+3}, L_{+3}] = L_{+3}$ [L

So the space of physical states is a triple intersection:

$$\mathcal{U}_{phys} = \begin{bmatrix} z \\ \bigcap_{K=1}^{z} Ker(L_{K}) \end{bmatrix} \cap Ker(L_{o} - \alpha)$$

6.1

We started a level-by-level analysis of the space of physical states. At level-zero, there is just 10jK? and the La constraint requires $\alpha' K^2 = \alpha \ (\alpha' = \frac{1}{2}k^2)$. So $\alpha < 0$: massive, $\alpha = 0$: massless, $\alpha > 0$: tachyon.

At level one, are had the general state $|S_jK\rangle = S_p \alpha_{-1}^H |O_jK\rangle$ obeying $\alpha' k^2 = \alpha - 1$, $S \cdot K = O$ and with norm $\sim S^2$, so to avoid negative-norm states, need no transverse, time-like polorizations, so k should be time-like or light-like.

6.2

The threshold case is interesting (a=1). Now K2=0, so we have a massless state with a spacetime vector index. Additionally, there is now a physical state with zero norm:

$$|K;K\rangle = (K\cdot\alpha_{-1})|O;K\rangle$$
 is "longitudinally polorized", physical because $K^2 = O$.

In Fact, IK;K> is orthogonal to all physical states

 $\langle K_{j}K|S_{j}K'\rangle = (K\cdot S) \delta(K-K') = 0$ since $\delta K'=0$ for physical state. So the longitudinal polarization decouples, leaving D-2 physical polarizations (like the photon!)

We observe that if a spurious state is itself physical, it must have zero norm (orthogonal to itself). A physical, spurious state is called a Null State. The longitudinal polarization state above cas exactly such a state. One expects to exacuter these in gauge theories with residual gouge symmetry as "pure gauge" states. Then we want to quotient by these.

We see that precisely for a=1, we have states given by the action of L-1 that are pure gauge and can be quotiented. This is a hint that a=1 is the "right value" for conformal invariance to be precient quantum mechanically.

Let's look at this last statement in more general language. The state L. 10; K> is manifestly L to physical states. To be spurious, need to adjust K so that

$$L_{0} - a L_{-1} |0; k\rangle = L_{-1} (L_{0} - a + 1) |0; k\rangle = 0$$
 if $L_{0} |0; k\rangle = (a - 1) |0; k\rangle$

State is then physical if we have

$$L_{+1} (L_{-1} | o_{jk} \rangle) = (2L_{0} - L_{-1} L_{+1}) | o_{jk} \rangle = 2L_{0} | o_{jk} \rangle = 2(a-1) | o_{jk} \rangle = 0 \quad \text{iff} \quad a = 1.$$

$$L_{+2} (L_{-1} | o_{jk} \rangle) = (3L_{+1} + L_{-1} L_{+2}) | o_{jk} \rangle = 0$$

Can see the start of a more general argument. Any state of the form

$$|\mathcal{E}\rangle = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} L_{-m} |\mathcal{X}_{m}\rangle \quad \omega / L_{0} |\mathcal{X}_{m}\rangle = (a-m) |\mathcal{X}_{m}\rangle$$

is spuricus. In fact, one can ague (I want here) that this is the form of the must general spurious state. But equivalently, this is just

Let's examine physical state condition, first of $|\tilde{\chi}_2\rangle = 0$ and assume $L_{+n}|\tilde{\chi}_1\rangle = 0$ (m>c). Then $L_{+1}|\tilde{\xi}\rangle = (2L_0 + L_{-1}L_{+1})|\tilde{\chi}_1\rangle = (a_{-1})|\tilde{\chi}_1\rangle = 0$ iff a = 1

$$L_{+1}|S\rangle = (2L_{0} + L_{-1}L_{+1}) + \lambda_{1}\gamma = (a-1) + \lambda_{1}\gamma$$

$$L_{+2}|S\rangle = (3L_{+1} + L_{-1}L_{+2}) + \lambda_{1}\gamma = 0$$

So we get an infinite class of null stater generalizing IKiK>. Now consider state of L-z action:

$$\xi > = (L_{-z} + \gamma L_{-1}^{z}) | \widetilde{\chi}_{z} > , \text{ assume } L_{1m} | \widetilde{\chi}_{z} > = 0 \text{ (mpo)}$$

Physical state conditions are more laborious now.

$$\begin{split} L_{+1} | \mathfrak{F} \rangle &= \left(\mathfrak{Z} L_{-1} + L_{-2} L_{+1} + 2\Upsilon \left(L_{0} L_{-1} + L_{-1} L_{0} \right) + \Upsilon L_{-1}^{2} L_{+1} \right) | \mathfrak{X}_{2} \rangle \\ &= \left(\mathfrak{Z} + 2\Upsilon \left(\mathfrak{a}_{-1} + \mathfrak{a}_{-2} \right) \right) | \mathfrak{X}_{2} \rangle \\ &= \left(\mathfrak{Z} + \Upsilon \left(\mathfrak{U} \mathfrak{a}_{-6} \right) \right) | \mathfrak{X}_{2} \rangle = \mathfrak{O} \quad iff \quad \Upsilon = \frac{\mathfrak{Z}}{\mathfrak{G} - \mathfrak{U} \mathfrak{a}} \quad \left(= \frac{\mathfrak{Z}}{\mathfrak{Z}} \quad for \ \mathfrak{a} = 1 \right) \\ -\mathfrak{L}_{2} | \mathfrak{F} \rangle &= \left(\mathfrak{U} L_{0} + \frac{\mathfrak{D}}{\mathfrak{I}^{2}} \cdot \mathfrak{G} + \mathfrak{G} \Upsilon L_{0} \right) | \mathfrak{X}_{2} \rangle \\ &= \int (\mathfrak{U} + \mathfrak{G} \Upsilon) \left(\mathfrak{a}_{-2} \right) + \frac{\mathfrak{P}}{\mathfrak{Z}} \left[1 \mathfrak{X}_{2} \right\rangle = \mathfrak{O} \quad iff \quad \mathsf{D} = (\mathfrak{Z} - \mathfrak{o}) \left(\mathfrak{R} + \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{L} \Upsilon \right) = \mathfrak{Z} \mathfrak{G} \quad for \ \mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{I} \end{split}$$

$$D = 26$$
 Known as "critical dimension", $(D = 26, a = 1)$ is the critical bosonic string.

For normal ordering constant, critical value was at threshold beyond which as found ghosts in the physical spectrum. An analogous result holds for the critical dimension. (We set a=1 for now).

Take level-Z state:
$$|\mathbf{x}_{K}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} c_{1} \mathbf{x}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{1} + c_{2} \mathbf{x}_{2} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{0} + c_{3} (\mathbf{x}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{0}) (\mathbf{x}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{0}) \end{bmatrix} |\mathbf{v}_{0} \cdot \mathbf{k}\rangle, \quad \mathbf{x}' \mathbf{k}^{2} = -1$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} L_{11} : c_{1} + c_{2} - 2c_{3} = 0 \\ L_{12} : Dc_{1} - 4c_{2} - 2c_{3} = 0 \\ |\mathbf{x}_{1}\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{-1} + \frac{D-1}{5} \mathbf{x}_{2} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{0} + \frac{D+Y}{10} (\mathbf{x}_{-1} \cdot \mathbf{x}_{0})^{2} \end{bmatrix} |\mathbf{v}_{0} \cdot \mathbf{k}\rangle \quad \text{physical for } \mathbf{a} = 1, \text{ any } D.$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} Computing the norm, \quad (\mathbf{x}_{1} \mid \mathbf{x}_{1}) > = \frac{2}{25} \mathbf{v} (\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{k}') (D-1) (D-26), \text{ so } 1 \le D \le 26 \text{ to avoid ghosts. Upon } D = 1 \text{ or } D = 26, \text{ this becomes exactly our null state.} \end{bmatrix}$$

So, at a=1 & D=26 there is a double enhancement of null states due to being "on the edge" of inconsistency. But now we're out of variables to play with, so if there are left over ghosts, are're out of luck.

(1972) Brower; Goddord, Thorn, "No ghost theorem": For a=1, D=26 the physical space of states & free of ghosts.

What about a < 1, 1 = D = 26? It turns out there are no phosts for $a \leq 1$, D < 25. However, away from criticality there are inconsistencies e level of string loops.

Remarks on other approaches:

- in light-cone gauge, monifectly ghost free, but spacetime Loventz requires a=1, D=26.

» M BRST quartization, a=1, D=26 required for quantum gauge (conformal) invariance.

Next week: closed string, scattering,

(6.4