

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

$A \Rightarrow B.$

$$|\sum B_i a_i| = |\sum B_i \langle f, x_i \rangle| \leq |\sum B_i| \|f\| \|x_i\| = \|f\| \left| \sum B_i \|x_i\| \right| \stackrel{M.}{=} \|f\| \left| \sum B_i \|x_i\| \right|$$

$B \Rightarrow A.$

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

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

$g$  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

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

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 1.1  $\Rightarrow |\sum B_i a_i| \leq M |\sum B_i f_i| = 0 \Rightarrow \sum B_i a_i = 0$ .

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.