## Weakly Dense Subgroups of Banach Spaces

## S. J. SIDNEY

- 1. Introduction. In a recent talk, D. J. Newman asked whether the following statement is true for every (real) Banach space X and every proper closed (additive) subgroup G of X:
  - (\*) There is a non-zero continuous linear functional on X which assumes only integer values on G.

If (\*) were always true, it could be applied to groups in much the same way as the Hahn-Banach Theorem is applied to convex sets, resulting in abstract approximation theorems. The truth of (\*) is well-known and not difficult to verify (see proof of Theorem 1) if X is finite-dimensional; it is trivial if the linear span of G is not dense in X.

It is our primary purpose here to show that this statement is false, at least if X is separably infinite-dimensional, for some proper closed subgroup of X (Theorem 5); this includes X = C[0, 1], the case of special interest to Newman. The same conclusion holds for many non-separable X, and we have yet to find such an X for which we can verify (\*) for all G. The case in which there is a sublattice (i.e., discrete subgroup) for which (\*) fails is of special interest, and arises naturally en route to the main result.

The connection between (\*) and the title is made by

**Theorem 1.** If G is an additive subgroup of a real Banach space  $X \neq \{0\}$ , then (\*) fails to hold if and only if G is weakly dense in X.

This and other general results will be proved in Section 2. In Section 3 the main results—construction of counter-examples to (\*)—are presented. Finally, a related finite-dimensional problem is discussed in Section 4.

Hereinafter the scalar field for all Banach spaces will be assumed to be  $\mathbb{R}$ , the field of real numbers. Our results generally have complex analogues which follow immediately if we insist that G be closed under multiplication by i and if we replace the integers  $\mathbb{Z}$  by  $\mathbb{Z} + i\mathbb{Z}$ .

I am indebted to the referee and E. Odell for the present version of the main result (Theorem 5), which is substantially more general than my original theo-