

1.10. $(x_i)_{i \in I} \subset E \wedge (a_i)_{i \in I} \subset \mathbb{R}$.

$A \Rightarrow B$.

$$|\sum B_i a_i| = |\sum B_i \langle f, x_i \rangle| \leq |\sum B_i| \|f\| \|x_i\| = \|f\| \left(\sum B_i \|x_i\| \right)$$

$B \Rightarrow A$.

$$g: x \longmapsto f(x)$$

$$\sum_j B_j x_j \longmapsto \sum_j B_j a_j \quad \text{since } x = \sum_j B_j x_j \text{ since } (x_i) \text{ is H and B.B.I.}$$

g is linear by definition.

g is cont since if $\|p - q\| < \delta$, $p = \sum B_i x_i$, $q = \sum C_i x_i$ then

$$|f(p) - f(q)| = \left| \sum_j B_j a_j - \sum_j C_j a_j \right| = \left| \sum_{j \cup j'} K_j a_j \right| \leq M \left\| \sum_{j \cup j'} B_j - C_j x_j \right\| \leq M \delta = \epsilon.$$

Thus $g \in \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{R} x_i^* \subset E$. Hence by Cor. 2, $\exists f \in E^* : f|_{\bigoplus \mathbb{R} x_i} = g$.

This gives us that $f(x_i) = g(x_i) = a_i$.

1.12.

$A \Rightarrow B$ is obvious. $B \Rightarrow A$, using 1.11 $\Rightarrow |\sum B_i a_i| \leq M |\sum B_i t_i| = 0 \Rightarrow \sum B_i a_i = 0$.

1.13.

I think they just stress that point (it's own scalar product), because if V has the induced one, then as V is dense in H but is also complete w.r.t the same norm, $V=H$ and the situation becomes trivial.

And yes, indeed the truth is that you will get an isomorphism between V and V^* . The whole remark is about the dangers of replacing this canonical isomorphism with the act of actually identifying V and V^* . This would give you an inclusion of sets which forces $V=H$ (as sets), which need not be true.