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1. Introduction. An intensive studying of hereditary torsions began due to the papers of P. Gabriel [1] and J.-M. Maranda [2], where there was stated a bijective correspondence between hereditary torsions and radical filters of rings. In 1966 S.E. Dickson established the correspondence between the classes of objects of an abelian category and the idempotent preradicals [3]. Also, the torsion theory was used in the theory of rings of quotients. All these results were summarized and unified in the monographs of A.I. Kashu [4] and B. Stenström [5].

In 1967, (on the International conference in Riga) L.A. Skorniakov posed the problem of constructing the radical in the category of all modules over different rings. In 1971, O.L. Horbachuk solved this problem and established connection between this radical and radicals in the concrete categories of modules. These investigations were continued by O.L. Horbachuk and N.Yu. Burban in 2008 [6].

In this paper we carry some theorems proved by A.I. Kashu in [4] (for a module category) over the category of all modules over different rings (which is not abelian).
2. Main result. Throughout the whole text, all rings are considered to be associative with $1 \neq 0$ and all modules are left unitary [7, 8]. Let $R$ be a ring. The category of left $R$-modules will be denoted by $R$-Mod. All necessary definitions and theorems of the Torsion theory and Category theory can be found in $[4,5,9,10]$.

A pair of mappings $(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$, where $\varphi: R_{1} \rightarrow R_{2}$ is an onto ring homomorphism, and $\psi: M_{1} \rightarrow M_{2}$ is a homomorphism of abelian groups, is called

[^0]a semilinear transformation if $\forall r \in R_{1}, \forall m_{1} \in M_{1}$
$$
\psi\left(r_{1} m_{1}\right)=\varphi\left(r_{1}\right) \psi\left(m_{1}\right)
$$

Let $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ be a category of all left modules over all rings. More precisely, the objects of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ are the pairs $(R, M)$, where $R$ is a ring, $M$ is a left module; the set of morphisms $\operatorname{Hom}\left(\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right),\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)\right)$ is defined as a quotient set of a collection of all semilinear transformations $(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$ by the equivalence relation $\sim$ such that $(\varphi, \psi) \sim\left(\varphi^{\prime}, \psi^{\prime}\right)$, if $\psi=\psi^{\prime}$, and the product of morphisms is defined naturally. The class, determined by the semilinear transformation $(\varphi, \psi)$ will be denoted by $(\varphi, \psi)$, or, more frequently, $(\varphi, \psi)$. It is easy to verify that $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is a category.

A class $(\varphi, \psi)$ is a monomorphism (resp., an epimorphism) in the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ if $\psi$ is a monomorphism (resp., an epimorphism) in the category of abelian groups. The objects $(R, 0)$ and the morphisms $(\widetilde{\varphi, 0})$ are zero objects and zero morphisms in the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, respectively (see [6]).

Now recall some definitions [5, 9, 10].
Definition 1. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a category with zero object and zero morphisms, and let $\alpha: A \rightarrow B$. We will call a morphism $u: K \rightarrow A$ the kernel of $\alpha$ if $\alpha u=0$, and if for every morphism $u^{\prime}: K^{\prime} \rightarrow A$ such that $\alpha u^{\prime}=0$ we have a unique morphism $\gamma: K^{\prime} \rightarrow K$ such that $u \gamma=u^{\prime}$. The object $K$ is denoted by Ker $\alpha$ and the morphism $u$ is denoted by ker $\alpha$.
$A$ morphism $v: B \rightarrow E$ is called the cokernel of $\alpha$ if $v \alpha=0$, and if for every morphism $v^{\prime}: B \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ such that $v^{\prime} \alpha=0$ we have a unique morphism $\delta: E \rightarrow E^{\prime}$ such that $\delta v=v^{\prime}$. The object $E$ is denoted by Coker $\alpha$ and the morphism $v$ is denoted by coker $\alpha$.

Definition 2. If $A^{\prime} \rightarrow A$ is the kernel of some morphism then we call $A^{\prime}$ a normal subobject of $A$ (or an ideal). Dually, if $A \rightarrow A^{\prime \prime}$ is the cokernel of some morphism, then we call $A^{\prime \prime}$ a conormal quotient object of $A$.
Definition 3. A category $\mathcal{A}$ is abelian if
A0. $\mathcal{A}$ has the zero object.
A1. For every pair of objects there is a direct product and
A1*. a direct sum.
A2. Every map has the kernel and
A2*. the cokernel.
A3. Every monomorphism is the kernel of a map.
A3*. Every epimorphism is the cokernel of a map.
In the paper [6] some properties of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ were be stated:

1. For arbitrary objects $\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right), i \in I$, of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ there exists the direct product belonging to $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$. In particular, the object $(R, M)$, where $R=\prod_{i \in I} R_{i}$, is a direct product of the rings $R_{i}$ and $M=\prod_{i \in I} M_{i}$ is a direct product of the abelian groups $M_{i}$, and the morphisms $\left(s_{i}, \pi_{i}\right):\left(\prod_{i \in I} R_{i}, \prod_{i \in I} M_{i}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)$, where $s_{i}$ is the projection of $\prod_{i \in I} R_{i}$ onto $R_{i}$ and $\pi_{i}$ is the projection of $\prod_{i \in I} M_{i}$ onto $M_{i}$ determine a direct product of the objects $\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right), i \in I$, in the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.
2. Every morphism of $\cup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ has the kernel. In particular, let $(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)$ $\rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$ be a morphism of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$. Then the object ( $R_{1}$, Ker $\psi$ ) with a monomorphism $\left(1_{R_{1}}, i\right):\left(R_{1}, \operatorname{Ker} \psi\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)$, where $i$ is a canonical monomorphism, is the kernel of the morphism $(\varphi, \psi)$.
3. Every morphism of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ has the cokernel. In particular, let $(\varphi, \psi)$ : $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$ be a morphism of the category $\cup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$. Then the object $\left(R_{2}, M_{2} / \psi\left(M_{1}\right)\right)$ with an epimorphism $\left(1_{R_{2}}, \pi\right):\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2} / \psi\left(M_{1}\right)\right)$, where $\pi$ is a canonical epimorphism of $R_{2}$-modules, is the cokernel of the morphism $(\varphi, \psi)$ in the category $\cup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.

We want to verify whether the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is abelian or not, and if it is not abelian, then what axioms are not satisfied.

We know that the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ satisfies axioms A0, A1, A2 and A2*.
Now, consider the objects ( $\mathbb{Z}_{2}, M_{1}$ ) and $\left(\mathbb{Z}_{3}, M_{2}\right)$ of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ (e. g. $\left.M_{1}=\mathbb{Z}_{2}, M_{2}=\mathbb{Z}_{3}\right)$. Suppose that $(R, M)$ is the direct sum of these objects. In such a case we must have onto ring homomorphisms $\varphi_{1}: \mathbb{Z}_{2} \rightarrow R$ and $\varphi_{2}: \mathbb{Z}_{3} \rightarrow R$. Hence $R=\operatorname{Im} \varphi_{1}=\mathbb{Z}_{2}$ and $R=\operatorname{Im} \varphi_{2}=\mathbb{Z}_{3}(R \neq 0)$. Thus we obtain a contradiction. It means that in the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ there exist two objects for which the direct sum does not exist. Therefore, axiom A1* is not satisfied.

We want to show that no monomorphism $(\varphi, \psi):\left(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}_{2}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}, \mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)$ is the kernel of any morphism. Let $(\alpha, \beta):\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}, \mathbb{Z}_{2}\right) \rightarrow(R, M)$ be an arbitrary morphism, then $\operatorname{Ker}(\alpha, \beta)=\left(\mathbb{Z}_{2}, \operatorname{Ker} \beta\right)$. But all kernels are isomorphic. This provides a contradiction. Hence axiom A3 is not satisfied.

Similarly we can show for example that no epimorphism $(\varphi, \psi):\left(\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}_{4}\right) \rightarrow\left(\mathbb{Z}_{6}, \mathbb{Z}_{2}\right)$ is the cokernel of any morphism. Hence axiom $\mathrm{A} 3^{*}$ is not satisfied.

In the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ we shall state the following theorem which holds for abelian categories.
Theorem 1. Let $(\varphi, \psi):(R, M) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$ be a morphism in $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$. Then
1). $\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{coker}(\operatorname{ker}(\varphi, \psi)))=\operatorname{ker}(\varphi, \psi)$;
2). $\operatorname{coker}(\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{coker}(\varphi, \psi)))=\operatorname{coker}(\varphi, \psi)$.
$\operatorname{Proof.}$ 1). $\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{coker}(\operatorname{ker}(\varphi, \psi)))=\operatorname{ker}\left(\operatorname{coker}\left((R, \operatorname{Ker} \psi) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{R, i}\right)}(R, M)\right)\right)=$
$=\operatorname{ker}\left((R, M) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{R}, \pi\right)}(R, M / \operatorname{Ker} \psi)\right)=(R, \operatorname{Ker} \psi) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{R}, i\right)}(R, M)=\operatorname{ker}(\varphi, \psi)$.
2). $\operatorname{coker}(\operatorname{ker}(\operatorname{coker}(\varphi, \psi)))=\operatorname{coker}\left(\operatorname{ker}\left(\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{R^{\prime}}, \pi\right)}\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime} / \operatorname{Im} \psi\right)\right)\right)=$
$=\operatorname{coker}\left(\left(R^{\prime}, \operatorname{Im} \psi\right) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{\left.R^{\prime}, i\right)}\right.}\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \xrightarrow{\left(1_{R^{\prime}}, \pi\right)}\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime} / \operatorname{Im} \psi\right)=$
$=\operatorname{coker}(\varphi, \psi)$.
Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an arbitrary concrete category with zero objects and zero morphisms. Recall that a category is called concrete if all objects are (structured) sets, morphisms from $A$ to $B$ are (structure preserving) mappings from $A$ to $B$, the composition of morphisms is the composition of mappings, and the identities are the identity mappings [12].
Definition 4. A preradical functor (or simply a preradical) on $\mathcal{A}$ is a subfunctor of the identity functor on $\mathcal{A}$. In other words, a preradical functor $T$ assigns to each object $A$ a
subobject $T(A)$ in such a way that the diagram

where $i_{1}, i_{2}$ are monomorphisms, is commutative.
Definition 5. A preradical functor $T$ is called idempotent if $T(T(A))=T(A)$ for every $A \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$.

To a preradical functor $T$ one can associate two classes of objects of $\mathcal{A}$, namely

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{T}_{T}=\{A \mid T(A)=A\} \\
& \mathcal{F}_{T}=\{A \mid T(A)=0\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark 1. Throughout the whole text, all preradical functors on the category
$\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ are considered to be such that theirs restrictions on every category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$ are preradical functors, i. e. $T(R, M)=\left(R, T_{R}(M)\right)$, where $T_{R}$ is the restriction of the functor $T$ on the category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$.

Theorem 2. Let $T$ be a preradical functor on the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, then

1) The class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist).
2) The class $\mathcal{F}_{T}$ is closed under subobjects and direct products.
3) $\mathcal{T}_{T} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{T}=\{(R, 0)\}$.
4) $\operatorname{Hom}\left(\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right),\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{T},\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$.

Proof. 1) Let $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{T},(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$ be an epimorphism $\left(\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)\right.$ be a quotient object of $\left.\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)\right)$. Consider the commutative diagram


Since $(\varphi, \psi)$ is an epimorphism in the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, it means that $\varphi$ is a surjective ring homomorphism and $\psi$ is a surjective homomorphism of abelian groups. Hence $(\varphi, \psi)\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)=\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$. Since $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$, it follows that $T\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)=\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)$. By the definition of a preradical functor we obtain $T\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)=\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$, i. e. $\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \in$ $\mathcal{T}_{T}$.

Let $\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right), i \in I$, be an arbitrary family of objects in $\mathcal{T}_{T}$, for which the direct sum exists. Consider the canonical monomorphisms $\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right):\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)$ and the
commutative diagram

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) & \xrightarrow{\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right)}
\end{array} \begin{gathered}
\bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) \\
\uparrow \\
T\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) \xrightarrow{T\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right)} T\left(\bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)
\end{gathered}
$$

We obtain that $\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right)\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) \subseteq T\left(\bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)$ for every $i \in I$, and by the definition of the direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)=T\left(\bigoplus_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)$.
2) Let $(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$ be a monomorphism, $\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$. Consider the commutative diagram


Since $T\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)=\left(R_{2}, 0\right)$, and by the definition of a preradical functor

$$
(\varphi, \psi)\left(T\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)\right) \subseteq T\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)
$$

it follows that $(\varphi, \psi)\left(T\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)\right) \subseteq\left(R_{2}, 0\right)$. Furthermore, $(\varphi, \psi)$ is a monomorphism in $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ ( $\varphi$ is a surjective ring homomorphism and $\psi$ is an injective homomorphism of abelian groups), thereby $T\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)=\left(R_{1}, 0\right)$, i. e. $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$.

Let $\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right), i \in I$, be an arbitrary family of objects in $\mathcal{F}_{T}$, i. e. $T\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)=\left(R_{i}, 0\right)$ $\forall i \in I$. Consider the canonical epimorphisms $\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right): \prod_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)$ and the commutative diagram


Hence $\left(\varphi_{i}, \psi_{i}\right)\left(T\left(\prod_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)\right) \subseteq T\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)$ for every $i \in I$. Thus $T\left(\prod_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)$ $\subseteq \prod_{i \in I}\left(T\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right)=\prod_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, 0\right)$, i. e. $T\left(\prod_{i \in I}\left(R_{i}, M_{i}\right)\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$.
3) Suppose that $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{T}$. It means that $T(R, M)=(R, M)$ and $T(R, M)=(R, 0)$. Therefore $\mathcal{T}_{T} \bigcap \mathcal{F}_{T}=(R, 0)$.
4) Let $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{T},\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T},(\varphi, \psi):\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \rightarrow\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)$. Consider the commutative diagram


Since $T\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)=\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right)$ and $T\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)=\left(R_{2}, 0\right)$, we obtain the commutative diagram


Thus $(\varphi, \psi)=(\varphi, 0)$. Hence $\operatorname{Hom}\left(\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right),\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $\left(R_{1}, M_{1}\right) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$, $\left(R_{2}, M_{2}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$.

Definition 6. A class $\mathcal{P}$ of objects of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is called a pretorsion class if it is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist).

Theorem 3. There is a bijective correspondence between the idempotent preradical functors of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ and the pretorsion classes of objects of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.
Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $T$ be an idempotent preradical functor, $\mathcal{T}_{T}=\{(R, M) \mid T(R, M)=$ $=(R, M)\}$. By Theorem 2, the class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist), hence $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is a pretorsion class for the preradical functor $T$.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a pretorsion class, $(R, M)$ be an arbitrary object of $\mathcal{P}$. Consider $t_{R}(R, M)=\sum_{i \in I}\left\{\left(R, M_{i}\right)\right\}$, where $\left(R, M_{i}\right)$ are normal subobjects of $(R, M),\left(R, M_{i}\right) \in \mathcal{P}$. We know that $t_{R}$ is a preradical functor on every category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$ (see e. g. [4]). Since the pretorsion class $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under quotient objects it follows that the preradical functors $t_{R}$ generate a preradical functor $T$ on $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ (see [6]).

Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be arbitrary concrete categories with zero objects and zero morphisms.
Definition 7. Let $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ be functors from a category $\mathcal{A}$ to a category $\mathcal{B}$. The functor $T_{1}$ is called a subfunctor of the functor $T_{2}$ (denote $T_{1} \leqslant T_{2}$ ) if $T_{1}(A)$ is a subobject of $T_{2}(A)$ (denote $T_{1}(A) \subseteq T_{2}(A)$ ) for every $A \in O b(\mathcal{A})$ and the following diagram

is commutative for every morphism $\varphi: A_{1} \rightarrow A_{2}, A_{1}, A_{2} \in O b(\mathcal{A})$.
Definition 8. A functor $T_{1}$ is called a normal subfunctor of the functor $T_{2}$ if $T_{1}(A)$ is a normal subobject of $T_{2}(A)$ for every $A \in O b(A)$.

As a rule we will consider the cases, when the categories $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ coincide.

Definition 9. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a category, $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ be functors on $\mathcal{A}$ such that $T_{1}$ is a normal subfunctor of $T_{2}$. A factor-functor $T_{2} / T_{1}$ is a functor such that $\left(T_{2} / T_{1}\right)(A)=$ $=T_{2}(A) / T_{1}(A) \forall A \in O b(\mathcal{A})$ and the following diagram is commutative

where $i_{1}, i_{2}$ are normal monomorphisms, $\pi_{1}, \pi_{2}$ are conormal epimorphisms.
Definition 10. A preradical functor $T$ on a category $\mathcal{A}$ is called a radical functor if $T(I / T)=0$, where $I$ is an identity functor.

Definition 11. A class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is said to be closed under extensions if for every exact sequence $\left(R^{\prime}, 0\right) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow(R, M) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime \prime}, M^{\prime \prime}\right) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime \prime}, 0\right)$ with $\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$ and $\left(R^{\prime \prime}, M^{\prime \prime}\right)$ in $\mathcal{T}_{T}$, also $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$. A class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is said to be closed under normal extensions if it is closed under extensions and $R^{\prime}=R=R^{\prime \prime}$.

Theorem 4. Let $T$ be an idempotent radical functor on the category $\cup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, then

1) The class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects, direct sums (if they exist) and normal extensions.
2) The class $\mathcal{F}_{T}$ is closed under subobjects, direct products and normal extensions.
3) $\mathcal{T}_{T}=\left\{(R, M) \in O b(\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}) \mid \operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)\right.$
$\left.\forall\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}\right\}$
4) $\mathcal{F}_{T}=\left\{\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \in \operatorname{Ob}(\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}) \mid \operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)\right.$
$\left.\forall(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}\right\}$
Proof. 1) The class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist) (see theorem 2).

Since we want to prove that $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under normal extensions, it is sufficient to work in the category $R-M$ od. But in every category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$ the class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under extensions (see [4]).
2) Apply Theorem 2 (2), and the proof of the closure under normal extensions is the same as previous.
3) $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$, then by Theorem $2 \operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Now let $(R, M)$ be a such object that $\operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$. By the condition, $T$ is a radical functor, so

$$
T((R, M) / T(R, M))=(R, 0)
$$

i. e. $(R, M) / T(R, M) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$. Consider the morphism $(\varphi, \psi):(R, M) \rightarrow(R, M) / T(R, M)$. Since $(R, M) / T(R, M) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$ and $(\varphi, \psi)$ is an surjective homomorphism it follows that $(R, M) / T(R, M)=(R, 0)$. Hence $T(R, M)=(R, M)$, i. e. $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$.
4) $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \in \mathcal{F}_{T}$, then $\operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$ (by Theorem 2 ).
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Conversely, let $\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$ be a such object that $\operatorname{Hom}\left((R, M),\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=(\varphi, 0)$ for every $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$. Assume that $T\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)=\left(R^{\prime}, M^{*}\right)$. Consider a morphism $(\varphi, \psi):(R, M) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$, and the commutative diagram

$T(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$ because $T$ is an idempotent, i. e. $T\left(T\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)\right)=T\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$. Since $(\varphi, \psi)(R, M)=(R, 0)$, then there exists a nonzero monomorphism $T\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right) \rightarrow\left(R^{\prime}, M^{\prime}\right)$. This provides a contradiction.

Definition 12. A class $\mathcal{P}$ of objects of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is called a torsion class if it is closed under quotient objects, direct sums (if they exist), and normal extensions.

Theorem 5. There is a bijective correspondence between idempotent radical functors of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ and torsion classes of objects of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.
Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $T$ be an idempotent radical functor,

$$
\mathcal{T}_{T}=\{(R, M) \mid T(R, M)=(R, M)\}
$$

By Theorem 4, the class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects, direct sums (if they exist), and normal extensions, hence $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is a torsion class for the radical functor $T$.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a torsion class. We know that the class $\mathcal{P}$ generates the preradical functor $T$ on the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ (see Theorem 3). Since the torsion class $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under normal extensions it follows that on every category $R$-Mod the restriction of $T$ is a radical functor. But in the paper [6] it was proved that a preradical functor on $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is a radical functor if and only if its restriction in every category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$ is a radical functor.

Definition 13. Let $T$ be an idempotent preradical functor of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, $(R, M) \in \mathcal{T}_{T}$. If every normal subobject of $(R, M)$ belongs to $\mathcal{T}_{T}$, then $T$ is called a pretorsion functor.

Definition 14. A pretorsion functor is called a torsion functor if it is a radical one.
Theorem 6. There is a bijective correspondence between pretorsion functors of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ and pretorsion classes of objects of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, closed under normal subobjects.

Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ Let $T$ be a pretorsion functor, $\mathcal{T}_{T}=\{(R, M) \mid T(R, M)=(R, M)\}$. By Theorem 2 the class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist). By the definition of a pretorsion functor the class $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is closed under normal subobjects, hence $\mathcal{T}_{T}$ is a pretorsion class, closed under normal subobjects.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a pretorsion class, closed under normal subobjects. In every category $R-\operatorname{Mod}$ the class $\mathcal{P}$ generates a pretorsion functor (see e. g. [4]). By Theorem 3, if a class is closed under quotient objects and direct sums (if they exist), then it generates a preradical
functor of the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$. But if a preradical functor of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is a pretorsion functor on every $R-\operatorname{Mod}$, then it is a pretorsion functor of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.

Theorem 7. There is a bijective correspondence between the torsion functors of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ and the torsion classes of objects of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$, closed under normal subobjects.

Proof. $(\Longrightarrow)$ See the proofs of Theorems 5 and 6.
$(\Longleftarrow)$ Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a torsion class, closed under normal subobjects. We know that the class $\mathcal{P}$ generates a radical functor $T$ on the category $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ (see the proof of the theorem 5). Since $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under normal subobjects, it follows that $\mathcal{P}$ is closed under subobjects in every category $R$-Mod. Thus, on every $R$-Mod it generates a torsion functor. And we know that if a radical functor of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$ is a torsion functor on every $R$-Mod, then it is a torsion functor of $\bigcup \mathcal{R}-\mathcal{M o d}$.
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#### Abstract

Вивчено деякі властивості прерадикальних і радикальних класів у категорії всіх модулів над різними кільцями, а також є зв'язок між цими класами та ідемпотентними прерадикальними, радикальними, преперіодичними та періодичними функторами.
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#### Abstract

Изучено некоторые свойства предрадикальных и радикальных классов в категории всех модулей над разными кольцами, а также устанавливается связь между этими классами и предрадикальными, радикальными, предпериодическими и периодическими функторами.
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