which is presented in this work allowing to represent properties of spaces with algebraic (or categorical) formulas.

Proximity structures were introduced by Smirnov in [11].

Some references to predecessors:

- In [15, 16, 25, 2, 36] generalized uniformities and proximities are studied.
- Proximities and uniformities are also studied in [22, 23, 35, 37, 38].
- [20, 21] contains recent progress in quasi-uniform spaces. [21] has a very long list of related literature.

Some works ([34]) about proximity spaces consider relationships of proximities and compact topological spaces. In this work the attempt to define or research their generalization, compactness of funcoids or reloids is not done. It seems potentially productive to attempt to borrow the definitions and procedures from the above mentioned works. I hope to do this study in a separate volume.

[10] studies mappings between proximity structures. (In this volume no attempt to research mappings between funcoids is done.) [26] researches relationships of quasi-uniform spaces and topological spaces. [1] studies how proximity structures can be treated as uniform structures and compactification regarding proximity and uniform spaces.

This book is based partially on my articles [30, 28, 29].

1.6. Kinds of continuity

A research result based on this book but not fully included in this book (and not yet published) is that the following kinds of continuity are described by the same algebraic (or rather categorical) formulas for different kinds of continuity and have common properties:

- discrete continuity (between digraphs);
- (pre)topological continuity;
- proximal continuity;
- uniform continuity;
- Cauchy continuity;
- (probably other kinds of continuity).

Thus my research justifies using the same word “continuity” for these diverse kinds of continuity.

See http://www.mathematics21.org/algebraic-general-topology.html

1.7. Responses to some accusations against style of my exposition

> The proofs are generally hard to follow and unpleasant to read as they are just a bunch of equations thrown at you, without motivation or underlying reasoning, etc.

I don’t think this is essential. The proofs are not the most important thing in my book. The most essential thing are definitions. The proofs are just to fill the gaps. So I deem it not important whether proofs are motivated.

Also, note “algebraic” in the title of my book. The proofs are meant to be just sequences of formulas for as much as possible :-) It is to be thought algebraically. The meaning are the formulas themselves.

Maybe it makes sense to read my book skipping all the proofs? Some proofs contain important ideas, but most don’t. The important thing are definitions.