

iff  $\lambda$  is a zero of  $\chi_f(X)$ . Therefore, the minimal and the characteristic polynomials have the same zeros (in  $K$ ), except for multiplicities.

*Proof.* First assume that  $m(\lambda) = 0$  (with  $\lambda \in K$ , and writing  $m$  instead of  $m_f$ ). If so, using polynomial division,  $m$  can be factored as

$$m = (X - \lambda)q,$$

with  $\deg(q) < \deg(m)$ . Since  $m$  is the minimal polynomial,  $q(f) \neq 0$ , so there is some nonzero vector  $v \in E$  such that  $u = q(f)(v) \neq 0$ . But then, because  $m$  is the minimal polynomial,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= m(f)(v) \\ &= (f - \lambda \text{id})(q(f)(v)) \\ &= (f - \lambda \text{id})(u), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $f$ .

Conversely, assume that  $\lambda \in K$  is an eigenvalue of  $f$ . This means that for some  $u \neq 0$ , we have  $f(u) = \lambda u$ . Now it is easy to show that

$$m(f)(u) = m(\lambda)u,$$

and since  $m$  is the minimal polynomial of  $f$ , we have  $m(f)(u) = 0$ , so  $m(\lambda)u = 0$ , and since  $u \neq 0$ , we must have  $m(\lambda) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 31.2.** *Let  $f: E \rightarrow E$  be a linear map on some finite-dimensional vector space  $E$ . If  $f$  is diagonalizable, then its minimal polynomial is a product of distinct factors of degree 1.*

*Proof.* If we assume that  $f$  is diagonalizable, then its eigenvalues are all in  $K$ , and if  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$  are the distinct eigenvalues of  $f$ , and then by Proposition 31.1, the minimal polynomial  $m$  of  $f$  must be a product of powers of the polynomials  $(X - \lambda_i)$ . Actually, we claim that

$$m = (X - \lambda_1) \cdots (X - \lambda_k).$$

For this we just have to show that  $m$  annihilates  $f$ . However, for any eigenvector  $u$  of  $f$ , one of the linear maps  $f - \lambda_i \text{id}$  sends  $u$  to 0, so

$$m(f)(u) = (f - \lambda_1 \text{id}) \circ \cdots \circ (f - \lambda_k \text{id})(u) = 0.$$

Since  $E$  is spanned by the eigenvectors of  $f$ , we conclude that

$$m(f) = 0. \quad \square$$

It turns out that the converse of Proposition 31.2 is true, but this will take a little work to establish it.