

Екатерина Томова

(Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Факултет по педагогика)

Иван И. Илиев

(Софийски университет „Св. Климент Охридски“, Богословски факултет)

Как да тълкуваме термина „възпитание“ на български и на английски език?

Резюме: Статията представя резултати от изследване, насочено към изясняване на терминологичните и концептуални рамки относно термините „обучение“, „образование“ и „възпитание“. Целта на изследването е да се формулира термин, който би могъл да се използва за точно, цялостно и коректно описание на процеса на възпитание. Така формулирана, целта предполага следните изследователски въпроси:

1) Кои са основните термини, използвани в английския език, свързани с областта на образованието (в аспект на преподаване, учене и възпитание)?

2) Има ли подходяща дума или фраза в английския език, която може да се използва за обозначаване на понятието възпитание?

Тази цел определя следните изследователски задачи: проследяване на етимологията на ключови термини в областта на образованието от древни езици (старогръцки, латински и старобългарски); проследяване на етимологията на ключови термини в областта на образованието от староанглийски, средноанглийски и английски език; идентифициране на подходяща дума или фраза или комбиниране на такива думи или фрази, за да се конкретизира релевантен термин на английски език, еквивалентен на „възпитание“. Изследователските методи включват теоретичен анализ и сравнителен диахроничен и анахроничен анализ на термини и понятия. Резултатите очертават потенциала на термините ‘alumnation’, ‘cultivation’ и ‘formation’ като най-подходящи за описание на процеса на възпитание.

Ключови думи: педагогика, образование, обучение, възпитание, терминология, процес на възпитание

Ekaterina Tomova

(Sofia University ‘St Kliment Ohridski’, Faculty of Pedagogy)

Ivan I. Iliev

(Sofia University ‘St Kliment Ohridski’, Faculty of Theology)

How Is the Concept of ‘Education’ Interpreted in Bulgarian and English?

Introduction

In today’s increasingly interconnected and rapidly evolving world, education plays a central role in shaping not only individual lives but also the collective futures of societies worldwide. As nations grapple with challenges such as technological transformation, social inequality, and environmental crises, education emerges as a key instrument for fostering critical thinking, intercultural understanding, civic engagement, and sustainable development. The contemporary importance of education extends beyond the transmission of knowledge; it encompasses the formation of values, the cultivation of ethical judgment, and the development of skills necessary for lifelong learning and meaningful participation in diverse social contexts.

In this context, a clear and nuanced understanding of pedagogical terminology becomes essential. In the absence of precise and context-sensitive definitions, there is a risk that educational discourse may become ambiguous and fragmented. Clarifying these terminological concepts is a prerequisite for coherent policymaking, effective educational practice, and meaningful international dialogue on the goals and methods of education in the 21st century.

The term education in English is broad and multifaceted, encompassing processes such as learning, teaching, training, and cultivation. The contributions of these related terms enhance the concept's richness. Learning is defined as the acquisition of knowledge and skills; teaching as the transmission of knowledge; training as the development of specific competencies; and cultivation as a more refined, perhaps moral or aesthetic, development of a person (OED). Notwithstanding the observed lexical diversity, a conceptual gap remains within the English language. It is evident that these terms do not fully encapsulate the holistic process of shaping a person's values, character, ethical orientation, and social sensibilities; dimensions that are often considered central to the deeper meaning of education. This facet of the educational process can be delineated by several terms, including formation, cultivation, upbringing, nurturing, enculturation, and development. In the English language, there is an absence of a single word that expresses the integrated process of moral, social, emotional, aesthetic, etc. development – one that aims not only to inform but to shape a person.

In contrast, other languages possess terms that fill this gap. In Bulgarian, for example, the term *възпитание* (*vazpitanie*) encapsulates this intricate and formative aspect of education. The concept encompasses not only the cultivation of behavioural norms and social attitudes, but also the internalisation of values and the development of character. *Vazpitanie* is a concept that extends beyond mere instruction and training. It signifies a deliberate endeavour to guide individuals towards becoming ethically grounded, socially responsible, and culturally attuned members of society (Chavdarova-Kostova 2018). The present study explores the implications of this conceptual difference and argues for the importance of recognising and incorporating a holistic understanding of education into contemporary educational discourse. The article proposes adopting an appropriate term that encompasses and conveys all possible dimensions and manifestations of the formative component of the educational process.

Theoretical review

To arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the educational process, it is essential first to examine the core pedagogical terms that underpin it. The conceptualisation will be presented firstly from a pedagogical perspective, with definitions strictly outlined within the realm of Pedagogy. Subsequently, an investigation will be conducted into the etymological origins of the terms used to describe the multifarious dimensions of the educational process, to unravel their evolution and transformation.

The term pedagogy itself refers to 'the art, occupation, or practice of teaching; the theory or principles of education; a method of teaching based on such a theory' (OED). The term describes the relationships and 'interactions between teachers, students and the learning environment and the learning tasks' (Murphy 2008: 35). It should be noted that 'pedagogy is not simply describing the activity of teaching but reflects the production of broader social and cultural values within the learning relationship;' 'concepts of pedagogy reflect societal values and beliefs about learning,' teaching, training, and formation (Shah 2021: 2). In the most general scientific sense, pedagogy is characterised by two main functions: theoretical (studying the phenomena of education and formation/upbringing and their essence, patterns, and principles) and practical (aimed at the specific activity of shaping the individual). The combination of these two functions determines the practical and applied nature of the science of pedagogy (Gospodinov 2018). Theories and practices of pedagogy vary considerably across

different social, political, and cultural contexts (Shah 2021). All of the definitions highlight pedagogy as a complex science and art, encompassing the holistic development of a person across the cognitive, affective, and physical domains, including the formation of intellectual, social, moral, and other skills, attitudes, and competencies.

Pedagogy, in its general sense, denotes a systematic approach to the organisation of education. It is conceptualised as a scientific discipline comprising education, formation, teaching, and learning (Gospodinov 2018). From this standpoint, the next rational step is to establish definitions for the terms education, teaching, learning, and formation. Despite the extensive discourse surrounding the differentiation of the terms education, teaching and formation (Ibid.), and the numerous scientific debates concerning the potential synonymy of education with teaching and/or formation, contemporary scientific literature predominantly affirms education as the more extended term, including within its scope the terms teaching and formation (upbringing, cultivation). In the Bulgarian language, for instance, the structure is as follows: *obrazovanie* (translated as education) is the broader term, referring to the combination of teaching, learning, and formation; *obuchenie* (translated as education) is the more concrete term, related to the combination of teaching and learning, and *vazpitanie* (translated as education/formation/cultivation/upbringing) refers to the process of formation. In the present paper, the term formation is used as a substitute for the term *vazpitanie*, with the meaning noted above, which will be elaborated in the following sections.

Education (*obrazovanie*) is defined as a ‘complex, deliberate, purposeful, and organized process of interaction (activity) between certain factors of the social environment and people, within which there is a continuous transfer from these factors and assimilation by the individual of significant aspects of the collective social experience to support the overall personal development of the individual and the social reproduction and development of the society’ (Gospodinov 2018: 21). Hence, the processes of teaching and formation are inextricably intertwined, running parallel throughout the educational process. (Dimitrov 2016: 26) conceptualises education as the reflection of ‘the process, outcome, and degree of mastery of a specific system of knowledge, skills, and habits, based on which a corresponding worldview is built, and a person's potential and abilities are developed.’ It can be concluded that education is a lifelong process through which individuals acquire knowledge, skills, values, beliefs, and habits, while simultaneously developing their thoughts, emotions, opinions, and perspectives – both for personal growth and for contributing to the betterment of society (Doharey et al. 2023). The term education is also used to refer to a specific educational degree, the level of education attained, or the competence acquired in a given field (Dimitrov 2016). This fact alone indicates the interrelation between the terms mentioned earlier and their hierarchical connection: namely, that the educational degree encompasses both the acquisition of knowledge and skills and the formation of values, attitudes, beliefs, and social and moral norms. It is therefore evident that education, as a process, comprises three fundamental pillars: teaching, learning, and formation.

The distinction between the concepts of education (as teaching and learning) and formation is conditional; despite specific features – particularly in their essence and characteristics, as well as their main manifestations – these concepts overlap. It is impossible to conceive of and implement teaching and learning without formation or formation without education (or at least that is how it should be in the pedagogical practice). The two phenomena under discussion have been distinguished conditionally or treated as two aspects of a single phenomenon. Moreover, they have been the subject of relatively independent study within the two main branches of pedagogical science. Explorations in Theory of Education and Didactics aim to conduct a deeper examination of these subjects, thereby facilitating more robust and effective interaction between the domains of education and formation across a variety of pedagogical contexts (Gospodinov 2018).

Education (*obuchenie*) can be described as an activity that integrates teaching and learning (Petrov 1992). Gospodinov (2018: 21) defines it as ‘a type of pedagogical activity through which the transmission and assimilation by an individual of a certain socially conditioned minimum of experience (knowledge, skills, ways of knowing) related to the fundamentals of science and the most significant aspects of practical activity is achieved.’ Education cannot be reviewed comprehensively without acknowledging that it represents ‘an organizational functional unity between teaching and learning, through which the external and internal activity of the student is managed, and certain knowledge, skills, habits, and ways of cognition are formed in them’ (Andreev 1996: 14). More specifically, ‘formal face-to-face school education is a special organization of factors and conditions through which teaching, facilitation (mediation), and learning interact in a specific way so that learning proceeds more effectively and efficiently, more quickly, more systematically and rationally, scientifically sound, and more adequate to individual needs and sociocultural demands’ (Radev 2011: 22). Teaching and learning are complex and broad constructs, delineated by various authors and described in numerous ways. The term ‘teaching’ is similar to instruction, training, and schooling. It refers to the process of planning, organising, systematising, and presenting information (facts, data, concepts, hypotheses, theories, knowledge in general) to students in an accessible and understandable way that engages their attention, motivates them, and encourages their cognitive interest. However, it should be noted that the teacher's role in this process is not limited to the activities mentioned above (Delibaltova 2018). Other responsibilities include guiding the learning process, managing the classroom environment, and maintaining discipline. From this standpoint, ‘it is indisputable that teaching can only be thought of in relation to learning’ (Ibid.). Learning, as a process of perceiving, reproducing, comprehending, understanding, analysing, systematising, and applying knowledge and skills (in general), is considered a primary and fundamental process in the teaching-learning unity (Andreev 1996).

In summary, education can be defined as the integration of teaching and learning processes that occur in synergy, with the active participation of both teachers and students, and in accordance with individual and societal needs, interests, socio-cultural, psychological, and socio-emotional specifics.

Strongly related and inseparable from the process of education (as teaching and learning) is the process of formation (cultivation, nurturing, upbringing). Gospodinov (2018: 21) states that formation ‘can be described as a type of pedagogical activity, supporting the absorption of experience (knowledge, skills, attitudes) of the systems of intellectual, moral, aesthetical, physical, etc. values and beliefs, intending to form certain qualities and character traits and the whole personal development.’ The process itself is traditionally defined in the scientific literature as a sequence of stages, the implementation of which is intended to achieve the present goals and objectives (Chavdarova-Kostova 2018). This suggests that, to initiate the formation process, it is necessary to establish clearly defined goals and stages. However, it should be clarified that this is not always the case, as formative situations can arise outside the planned process. In such cases, it is possible to achieve results without pre-formulated aims, provided that the educator engages in a formative activity prompted by an emergent formative situation (Ibid.). This constitutes the broader scope of formation. In this context, it can be concluded that formation has two main definitions, differentiated by the scope of the process:

- 1) In its concrete pedagogical sense, the term formation refers to a deliberate, methodically designed, and systematically implemented process of influence and interaction aimed at cultivating a specific ideal of the human personality;

- 2) In a broad sense, the concept of formation encompasses indirect processes, devoid of pre-formulated precise goals, related to the socialisation and enculturation of the individual. These processes serve to neutralise negative influences and facilitate random positive

influences from the social environment, in accordance with certain views and ideas concerning personality formation (Dimitrov 2016). Nevertheless, the concepts of formation and socialisation are not synonymous. For the process of formation to occur, even in the context of randomly occurring formational situations, it must be directed by an adult, assessed, and implemented purposefully (even if the goals are determined situationally and in the moment). In contrast, socialisation occurs even without the specially planned participation of an adult. Instead, it refers to a person's integration into society, the assimilation of social rules and customs, and socially desirable models of behaviour (Dimitrov 2016).

Formation is understood to encompass influence, impact, and interactions, typically occurring between older and younger generations. The objective of these interactions is to transmit socially and personally significant experiences, to foster socially desirable qualities, values, and behavioural patterns, and to establish social and moral norms among adolescents (Chavdarova-Kostova 2016). In this sense, it may be considered a timeless phenomenon, existing in various forms, with different dimensions and content, since the dawn of human existence. Indeed, it has emerged as an essential component of societal development. The development of values, attitudes, and skills that unite individuals and transform them into active and responsible members of the community is a process of formation. However, societal advancement is predicated on individual progress. Consequently, the formative process exhibits a dual focus: firstly, it fosters the development of socially significant qualities such as responsibility, tolerance, and civic engagement; secondly, it contributes to harmonious personal development by supporting self-awareness, emotional maturity, and the pursuit of self-improvement. The matter may thus be considered from two perspectives: the social and the individual. From a social perspective, the primary function of formation is to 'support and maintain sociality, a sense of shared responsibility, a sense of belonging to a social group, and to foster a willingness to comply with the requirements of the group in question' (Chavdarova-Kostova 2016: 13). Concurrently, the individual perspective is intertwined with the development of the person – their abilities, talents and aptitudes, as well as specific qualities and interests. The focus here is on the personal dimension, on emotions, attitudes, views of oneself, on self-knowledge, self-development, and self-improvement; 'the improvement of the individual, his or her upward development' (Ibid. 15).

Therefore, by balancing and focusing on both social and personal aspects of personality development, formation includes interactions aimed at cultivating physical, intellectual, and moral qualities. Its content also covers the development of aesthetic needs and skills, creativity, critical thinking, a system of universal human values, a set of competencies, including personal, social, intercultural, and civic competencies, as well as social-emotional skills. It also encompasses a range of other key abilities, qualities, habits, and patterns of thinking and behaviour. The process of formation is associated with the development of qualities, skills, and habits; the internalisation of values, attitudes, and mindsets; the establishment of behavioural models, ways of thinking, views, and beliefs; and the cultivation of socio-cultural, social, and personal characteristics. This intricate, multifaceted, extensive, and complex process contributes to the overall development of personality across all aspects and prepares it for an active and meaningful life in society. It can be concluded that 'the meaning of formation lies both in its universal social timelessness and in the specifics of the reality of different practices related to different ideas of 'correct' behaviour, a 'good' and 'successful' personality' (Chavdarova-Kostova 2016: 21). The process of formation occurs predominantly within the familial context. However, it is also a crucial component of the school environment, with educators assuming a pivotal role in this process (MON 2015; hereinafter only MON).

The aforementioned definitions clearly emphasise the specifics of the formative process compared to those of education and teaching. The process of formation is implemented through

methods that differ from those of teaching: encouragement, punishment, and persuasion (formation), and lectures, storytelling, and presentations (teaching). The forms in which these two processes are implemented are often identical, given the indisputable need for parallel implementation of education and formation. However, one of these forms is explicitly designed for the formational process – the so-called form tutor class, defined as a non-lesson form of education (formation) (MON).

Consequently, teaching and formation are inextricably linked in the course of the educational process, yet they also possess distinctive features. Researching them both as intersecting processes and as separate phenomena is essential for ensuring a high-quality educational process. The identification of distinct terms that pertain exclusively to teaching and learning or to formation is pivotal for facilitating the study of these two phenomena, both in combination and independently. This, in turn, is essential to advancing pedagogy as a scientific discipline and to developing the pedagogical practice.

Methodology

The abovementioned is a prerequisite for conducting this study. The study aims to answer the following research questions:

1) What are the main terms used in the English language, related to the field of education (in the aspect of teaching, learning, and formation)?

2) Is there a suitable word or phrase in the English language that can be used to denote the concept of formation? This objective determines the following research tasks: tracing the etymology of key terms in the field of education from ancient languages (Ancient Greek, Latin and Old Bulgarian); tracing the etymology of key terms in the field of education from Old English, Middle English, and English; identifying a suitable word or phrase or combining such words or phrases to differentiate a relevant term for formation. The research methods include theoretical analysis and comparative diachronic and anachronistic analysis of terms and concepts.

Results

As we shall notice, there is a somewhat comprehensive etymological and symbolic difference in the origins of the modern Bulgarian terms' *обучение* (*obuchenie*), *образование* (*obrazovanie*) and *възпитание* (*vazpitanie*). All three derive from the earliest documented texts, stemming from the conversion of the Bulgarian Khanate to Orthodox Christianity, which began in 864 (KME III: 187–193). As of 893, at the Preslav Council, the so-called 'Old Bulgarian' in Bulgarian linguistics, confirmed as well by some Western scholars, such as Le Guillou (GdVB 1984) and Theissen (DAW 1991), and the Bulgarian historiography became the official language of the Church and the Bulgarian State (Miltenov 2024: 8–11). In other countries and traditions, the term 'Old Church Slavonic' is preferred, but it is undeniable that the earliest written texts in a vernacular Slavonic dialect were translated and composed in Bulgaria around the 9th–10th centuries AD. In the current study, the terms of these appellations are not discussed because they are not the focus of the research, and the information provided does not differ in the early stages of Slavic vernacular texts, regardless of which term is preferred by the wider public. Since this article is primarily intended for Bulgarian readers who may then present new pedagogical research in English, and for English readers who can now make the significant distinction among the Bulgarian concepts *obuchenie*, *obrazovanie* and *vazpitanie*, the term 'Old Bulgarian' will be used, with all the following contradictions, for which the authors take full responsibility.

Let's unfold the three terms by origin, usage and literal meaning that are still valid and unchanged, not only in Modern Bulgarian, since the language followed quite conservatively the

roots and kept the Medieval meaning and are even by this day in widespread use among *Slavia Orthodoxa* and beyond:

Об-уч-ение (obuchenie), *noun*, lit. ‘teaching’, ‘instruction’, ‘training’, ‘tuition’ (The Greek and Latin correspondences are given in brackets). These are the most common English translations of the term, but there is considerable misunderstanding and misuse surrounding them. The Old Bulgarian language had two verbs from which this noun derives, namely: оуѣати (сА), оуѣатиѣ (сА), оуѣатиши (сА) (MDSJA3: 1334; SJS 4: 727): х(р)истоуви братъ и сестра кестъ м(а)ти же наричеть сА оуѣати: тако и родитъ во г(о)сп(о)да: негоже въ с(ъ)рд(ъ)це в(ъ)ложитъ послѣдшающаго (Gregorii Magni papae Homiliae in evangelia, 13th century)) – ‘to teach anyone/myself’, ‘to instruct anyone/myself’ and оуѣити (сА), оуѣиѣ (сА), оуѣиши (сА) (Gr. διδάσκω, μαθάνω, μαθητεύομαι; Lat. doceo, doceor, studeo) (LM:1082–1083; MDSJA3: 1340–1341; SJS 4: 733–735; SR2: 1225–1226; Ribarova 2014: 384) – ‘to learn from anyone/for myself’, ‘to study from anyone/for myself’. (John 7:15) καὶ ἐθαύμαζον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες: πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε μὴ μεμαθηκώς – и дивлѣахъ сА иудеи глаголюхшѣ: како съ книгы оумѣатъ. не оуѣ сА – ‘And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?’¹(*Codex Marianus*, SR2: 1225); (Mt. 11: 1) μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν – прѣиде отъ тѣдѣ оуѣитъ – ‘he departed thence to teach’ (*Codex Marianus*, *Codex Suprasliensis*, etc.; SJS1: LXII, LXVII; SJS 4: 733). These verbs contain the root ‘оуѣ-/ѣ’ (both writings are possible) which gave another compound verb оуѣительствовати (Lat. doceo ‘to teach someone’(generatim)); derivative nouns such as оуѣеникъ ‘student’ (MDSJA3: 1336; SJS 4: 727–728; SR2: 1122); (Gr. μαθητής, Ribarova 2014: 384), φοιτητής, νήπιος, παῖς; Lat. discipulus); оуѣение (Mt. 16:12) τότε συνῆκαν ὅτι οὐκ εἶπε προσέχειν ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ’ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων – тѣгда разоумѣша тѣко рече храните сА. не отъ кваса хлѣбзнааго. нѣ отъ оуѣениѣ фарисеиска и садукееиска – ‘he bade *them* not beware of the leaven of bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees’ (*Codex Marianus*; LM: 1081; MDSJA3: 1334–1336; SJS 4: 728; SR2 1123); (Gr. διδαχή, διδασκαλία, διδασκάλιον (Ribarova 2014: 384), δίδαγμα, παραίνησις, ἀνάγνωσμα, γνῶσις, δόγμα, μάθησις, νοθεσία, παιδεία, τὸ διδασκαλεῖον, κατήχησις, etc.) ‘doctrine, teaching, principles, studies’ (and in military terms: ‘drill, exercise, practice’); оуѣеница (LM: 1081; SJS 4: 728; SR2 1122–1123); (Gr. μαθήτρια; Lat. discipula) ‘female student’; оуѣилище ‘school’ (LM: 1081; MDSJA3: 1336; SJS 4: 730); (generatim); оуѣитель (LM: 1082; MDSJA3: 1338; SJS 4: 732; SR2 1124–1125); (Gr. διδάσκαλος, ζηλωτής, παιδοτρίβης, ράββι) ‘teacher’; оуѣительница (LM: 1082; MDSJA3: 1339; Gr. διδάσκουσα; Lat. magistra) ‘a female teacher, schoolmistress’; the adjectives: оуѣеничь (LM: 1081; SJS 4: 728); (Gr. μαθητοῦ; Lat. discipuli); оуѣительевъ (SJS 4: 732–733; SR2: 1124); (Gr. τοῦ διδασκάλου); оуѣителььнъ (A word typical for *Codex Suprasliensis*, a Cyrillic manuscript from the 10th century with Bulgarian origin.) (LM: 1082; SJS 4: 732; SR2: 1125) ‘pertaining to teaching’ (Gr. διδασκαλικός, ‘διδакτικός’); оуѣительскъ (LM: 1082; MDSJA3: 1340) again, ‘pertaining to teaching’ (LM: 1082; Lat. magistri), оуѣительство/оуѣительствие LM: 1082; MDSJA3: 1340; SJS 4: 732; SR2: 1125); (Gr. διδασκαλία), (Lat. doctrina), оуѣлиивъ (LM: 1083; MDSJA3: 1343; Gr. διδακτικός), оуѣьнъ/оуѣенъ (LM: 1083; MDSJA3: 1336; SJS 4: 729–730); (Lat. ‘assuetus’) –

1) ‘to get used to something’, ‘to get/become used/accustomed (to something, to doing something, to do something)’; ‘to accustom/inure of something (to)’; ‘to acquire the habit (of)’; ‘to drop into a habit (of)’;

¹ All Bible quotations in English are according to the King James Bible.

2) ‘to habituate’, ‘to accustom’, ‘to train’, ‘to school’, ‘to inure to’); ‘to teach’; ‘to teach/train/acustom someone to be orderly’; ‘to train someone to discipline’; ‘to inculcate’; ‘to discipline/order into something’; ‘to learn’, ‘to train/teach one to something’, ‘inure one on service’, ‘to become inured to’;

3) habitual, usual, used to; ordinary, (well-) known (LRS: 106–107; LBR: 69); and an adverb *оучително* (LM:1082; Lat. *docendo*). The prefixes *об-/на-/из-/под-* etc. do not change the general meaning of the compound words, but indeed in some cases they add intensifying or underlying sense to the radix *оуч-*, hence *обовчати* (сА), *обовчатиѣ* (сА), *обовчатиѣши* (сА) (Gr. *γυμνάζω, γυμνάζομαι*; Lat. *doceo, doceo(r)*), *exerceo(r)*); ‘train’, ‘study’, ‘exercise (myself)’ etc.; *обовчавати* (сА), *обовчаватиѣ* (сА), *обовчаватиѣши* (сА) (Lat. *doceo(r)*), *обовчениѣ* (Lat. *doctrina*), *обовчити* (сА), *обовчѣ* (сА), *обовчѣши* (сА) (Gr. *διδάσκω, διδάσκομαι*; Lat. *doceo(r)*); *обовчатель*, *обовчитель* (Gr. *διδάσκαλος*; Lat. *docens, magister*) ‘tutor’, ‘mentor’, ‘preceptor’, ‘teacher’, ‘monitor’ (LM: 478; MDSJA2: 560) have more or less the same or quite similar meanings. On the other hand, the compound verbs with the prefix *на-* have the following meanings: *наовчати* (сА), *наовчатиѣ* (сА), *наовчатиѣши* (сА); *наовчевати* (сА), *наовчоватиѣ* (сА), *наовчоватиѣши* (сА), (LM: 416; MDSJA2: 345–346) (Gr. *καταμανθάνω, καταμανθάνομαι*; Lat. *disco, doceo(r)*), ‘admonish’, ‘exhort’, ‘tutor’, ‘monitor’; *наовчити* (сА), *наовчѣ* (сА), *наовчѣши* (сА) (SR1: 931–932); Gr. *διδάσκω, κατηχέομαι, μαθητεύομαι, μανθάνω*; Lat. *disco, doceo(r)*), while the nouns as it follows: *наовчѣ* and *наовчениѣ* (LM: 416; MDSJA2: 345–346) are synonyms in a wide sense (Gr. *παιδευσις, παιδεία*; Lat. *doctrina*) again, ‘doctrine’, ‘teaching’, ‘principles’, ‘studies’ (and in military terms: ‘drill’, ‘exercise’, ‘practice’), but also ‘knowledge’, ‘direction’, ‘instruction’, ‘admonition’, ‘advice’, ‘precept’, ‘exhortation’, ‘habit’, ‘habitude’ (Gr. *γνώμη* ‘opinion’; *δόγμα* ‘order’, ‘attitude’, ‘position’, ‘solution’); (Ibid.). The reflexive or reciprocal pronoun *сА* can be added to all verbs in the meaning of ‘teaching oneself’ or ‘study (by oneself)’, depending on the meaning/form of the Greek verb, or the intention of the author of the original Greek text, or the interpretation of the translator. There are no general rules of its usage, which makes creating trustworthy or complete Slavic dictionaries a rather difficult task. From the presented examples, we can draw the following conclusions:

1) the radix *оуч-* in general means ‘to teach someone or yourself’, or ‘to learn’, or ‘to exercise someone/yourself’, or ‘to train someone to do something’, ‘to create a habit’, but of course with a wide variety of meanings and usage;

2) nevertheless, the most common respective roots from Greek are the radices: *δασκ-* (to teach) (hence the Middle Bulgarian word and modern-day colloquial word *даскалъ*.); *μαθ-* (to study; to be a student); *παιδ-* (a child); *γυμν-* (exercise; hence ‘gymnasium’, or a ‘gym’ for the youth, not for children); *γνω-* (knowledge); and from Latin ones: *doc(e)-* (to teach); *magistr-* (a teacher); *stude-* (to study; to be a student); *exerce-* (to exercise); *disc-* (to study). Four of the five meanings or ‘ideas’ have a complete match, regardless of whether one can exercise himself or the other can teach and study simultaneously; it is a two-way process. The Slavonic radices do not contradict or deny the general concepts of the strict Ancient and Medieval education – the so-called *septem artes liberales* (including the *trivium* – *grammar, rhetoric, dialectics* – and the *quadrivium* – *arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music*) (LBR: 788). The school curriculum also included gymnastics in the free time, again, according to the Ancient belief *Mens sana in corpore sano* – ‘a healthy mind in a healthy body’.

3) even so, there is a wide separation in semantics of the Slavonic lexemes – their idea is of more self-improvement than the help of a tutor or a teacher; in other words, the process of education looks more like guidance and self-studying than a comprehensive class work in the modern sense. Not only was it presumed that the teacher gave simple instructions, but he was also improving as he guided the students.

4) The education was tightly connected to the newly converted to Christianity state, and the well-educated first Slavonic missionaries and creators of the Slavonic alphabet were considered more like preachers than literal teachers or tutors in the sense that we can confirm in the ‘Eulogy of Cyril the Philosopher by St Kliment Ohridski’, f. 37r: ПAMĀ и ПХВАĀ ПР^ѣБЛЖЕНОУ ѡЦОУ НАШЕЮ и НАСТАВНИКОУ (НАСТАВЬНИКОУ) СЛОВѢНСКОУ АЗЫКОУ КΥΡΙΛΑ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΑ и СѢТГ МΕΘΟΔΙΑ ΟΥΧΙΤΕΛѢ. ‘Eulogy of St. Preceptor of the Slavonic tongue, Cyril the Philosopher and Saint Methodius the Teacher.’ (KO: 418). St Cyril gave the idea, while St Methodius put it into practice. Other simple examples include: (Is. 2: 4) καὶ οὐ μὴ μάθωσιν ἔτι πολεμεῖν – не иматъ наоучити сѧ брати ‘neither shall they learn war any more.’ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 69); (Dan. 1: 4) ἐστάναι ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐνώπιον τοῦ βασιλέως, καὶ διδάξαι αὐτοὺς γράμματα καὶ γλῶσσαν Χαλδαίων – достояни быти въ црѣвѣ домѧ. и наоучити ѧ книгѧ. и азыкѧ халдѣискомѧ ‘had ability in them to stand in the king’s palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans.’ (Richard 2000: 14; Пиев 2017: 371). ‘This connection leads to a deep and lasting identification between theological doctrine ‘teaching’, from Greek διδασχή, παραινέσις, νουθεσία, δόγμα, μάθησις) and the ‘Word’ – understood as the sensible manifestation of the divine Λόγος.’ (Diddi 2012: 159–201). *Obuchenie* in this stream of thought in English should be literally translated as ‘teaching’, ‘studying’, ‘learning’, etc., depending on the collocation and the case study.

Образ-ова-ние (*obrazovanie*), *noun*, lit. ‘education’; ‘elementary/secondary education’; ‘higher/university/college education’; ‘specialized education’; ‘vocational training’; ‘classical/legal/medical/technical training’ in English means any kind of achieving of a form or specialization in a specific sphere of the human or natural knowledge. In Old Bulgarian, on the contrary, it was the best and actually the only way man could elevate to God, to serve Him right, and to deserve his right to be His equal: (Gen. 1: 27) κατ’ εἰκόνα Θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν – и створи бѣ ѡбразъ по образу бжѧи ѡмѧ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 18). ‘So God created man in his own image’. This way, man is unique among all of God’s creatures in having both a material (body, i.e. *ообразъ*; Ribarova 2014: 247–248) and an immaterial (soul/spirit, i.e. *доухъ/доуша*) part. The body and the soul must return to their primary condition when they were able to ‘listen to’ God (Gen. 3:8), which can only be achieved by knowledge and education. It is a widely accepted concept: ‘the very emergence of Slavic church literature (coinciding with the adoption of Christianity), faith and the written word are inextricably linked.’ (Diddi 2012: 159–201). In Bulgarian, the only word that is the one and only radix of the term *obrazovanie* is, namely, the Old Bulgarian lexeme *ообразъ* – ‘image’, ‘form’, ‘shape’, ‘picture’, ‘portrait’, ‘character’, ‘figure’, etc. But in Old Bulgarian *ообразъ* had a wider spectrum of meanings, and there were even closer to the divine nature of man, namely: ‘effigy’, ‘likeness’; ‘appearance’, ‘exterior’, ‘looks’; ‘illustration’, ‘pattern’; ‘way (of)’, ‘manner’; ‘mode’; ‘method’; ‘tenor’; ‘trace’, ‘track’, ‘trail’; ‘scar’, ‘mark’, ‘seam’, ‘birth-mark’, ‘sign’; ‘symbol’; ‘instance’; ‘example’; ‘case’; ‘model’, ‘pattern’, ‘standard’, ‘norm’; ‘character’, ‘temperament’, ‘nature’, ‘disposition’, ‘character’; ‘disposition’, ‘temper’; ‘mettle’; ‘make-up’; ‘characteristic’; ‘conduct’, ‘behaviour’; ‘demeanour’ etc. In most cases, *ообразъ* was translated or levelled up to the following Ancient and later Medieval notions: (Gr. μορφή; Lat. forma); (Gr. εἶδος; Lat. forma, species, figura); (Gr. ὁμοίωσις; Lat. similitudo); (Gr. εἰκών; Lat. imago); (Gr. σχῆμα; Lat. figura, schema); (Gr. χαρακτήρ; Lat. character); (Gr. ὄψις; Lat. facies, persona, schema); (Gr. πλάσμα; Lat. figmentum); (Gr. τύπος; Lat. figura); (Gr. ὑπόδειγμα; Lat. exemplar, exemplum); (Gr. τρόπος; Lat. modus); (Gr. σύμβολον; Lat. symbolum) (LM: 473; MDSJA2: 539–543; SJS 2: 484–486, SR2: 30–33). Even in the Middle Ages, there was a verb *ообразити, ообразжѧ, ообразити* (MDSJA2: 539; SJS 2: 484; SR2: 30) that still means ‘to create’, ‘to

teach', 'to enlighten', 'to demonstrate', 'to show'. There was another derivative verb from this noun, a synonym of *образити*, namely: *образовати* (сЛ), *образовати* (сЛ), *образовати* (сЛ) (MDSJA2: 539; SJS 2: 484; Schmidt 2017: 51; Iliev 2017: 377; 515) – *Commentarii in Daniele* A.15.5–6: Βαβυλῶν δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ κόσμος. οἱ δὲ δύο πρεσβύτεροι εἰς τύπον δείκνυνται τῶν δύο λαῶν τῶν ἐπιβουλεύοντων τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ – Вавилонъ же ѣ миръ. два же старца образѣта два лѣ. пакостѣициа цркви. – 'Babylon is the world. But the two elders represent the example of two peoples who scheme against the church' – 'to form'; 'to depict'; 'to create an image'; 'to symbolize', 'to embody'; 'to personify'; 'to put in order or in a certain position'; 'to imitate'; 'to copy'; 'to be imitative of'; 'to follow the example of'. Another example: (*Codex Suprasliensis* 484. 22–23): ИМАТЪ ЖЕ И ПЛАШТЪ ТЪ ИИЖ ПРИТЪУЖ. НЕ ТЪКМА БО ЦЪСАРСТВО ОБРАЗОВАШЕ. НЪ И КРЪВОИДЕНЬЕ И ОУБИСТВО ЖИДОВЪ ЯВЫШАШЕ. 'They have, and the cloak is another story. It was not the formation of a kingdom, but it appeared as bloodsucking and killing of Jews.' These verbs that are typically translated as the Greek ones *μορφῶ*, *σχηματίζω*, *εικονίζω* and *(ἐν)τυπῶ* are derived from the nouns we have already mentioned. The noun *образование* (Ibid.) had a meaning of a 'vision'; 'ghost'; 'phantasm', 'spectre', but also what interests us, namely 'education' and probably 'formation'. To conclude:

1) the Old Bulgarian idea of 'education' was the concept of levelling up man to God by means of literacy;

2) the most common Greek radices that correspond to the idea are: *μορφ-* (form); *εικον-* (image); *σχημ-* (scheme); *ὑποδεικ-* (example) *(ἐν)τυπ-* (figure); *συμβολ-* (symbol), while the Latin ones are as follows: *form-* (form); *imagin-* (image); *figur-* (figure); *exempl-* (example); *schem-* (scheme); *symbol-* (symbol);

3) the concept of 'education' and its usage in English in our context hereon could be looked up among these prime examples.

4) once again, it should be noticed that the Slavonic concepts do not by any means come from the Classical Latin derivative 'e-duc-ation'. The main verb 'duco' means predominantly 'to lead', while its derivative 'educio' is commonly considered as one of the modern terms 'education', and still, it is probably the best English translation for the term *obrazovanie*.

Възпита-ние (*vazpitanie*), *noun*, lit. 'upbringing', 'cultivation', is the hardest term of all three that needs the most profound and complex explanation. There are several research studies from a bird's eye view on the ancient education, formation, and school system, if we can even call it that way, some deeper and others just containing basic information on the processes. Vitanova, for instance, produced a satisfying but non-profound review of ancient thought on education, with insufficient conclusions (Vitanova 2015). Nikolova is of the opinion that 'traditionally, stemming from early Antiquity, upbringing and education (*παιδεία*) are conceived as the holistic cultivation of a person, as self-improvement through virtue. The school's goal should be to preserve most of the essence of the ancient and uniquely effective educational system, which has survived for dozens of centuries: the dialogical oral situation, the teacher-student situation, the holistic approach to education.' (Nikolova 2013: 285–287). No significant research has been conducted on the matters on schools, education, training or formation in Bulgaria during the Middle Ages, aside from some studies and books (for instance, GIBI 1968: 11–38 especially Kekaumenos' *Logos Nouthetikos*, *Λόγος Νουθητικός*, or 'Oration of Admonition to an Emperor' on education; Litavrin 1984: 123–136; Gjuzelev 1985, with the state of knowledge in Bulgaria 13th–14th centuries; ODB 1991: 677–678, with some general information from a bird-eye view; Istoriya 2008: 399–404; 618–621; 727–728 with a wide scope on the educational centers in the Bulgarian lands and on the Balkans; LBL 2014, with a focus on the connection between the Ancient educational and pedagogical practices and Byzantium; Hristov 2023: 35–93, who

focuses mainly on the educational and care-giving mission of the Catholic Church, etc.). There has been no linguistic approach or any analysis of the terms themselves or their usage to date. First, it must be emphasized that the term *vazpitanie* has always been used among the Slavs, later replaced among some, and remains used in the same sense among the Balkan Slavic peoples (Bulgarians, North Macedonians, Serbians), the Turkic and Greek peoples, and in Russia, past and present. Second, its appearance, usage, and connection to the ancient languages Greek and Latin through the Middle Ages have not yet been thoroughly explored diachronically, and our aim is to demonstrate that the term has not undergone any anachronistic change. Third, it is necessary to specify that ‘education’, ‘training’, ‘formation’, ‘cultivation’, or even ‘pedagogy’, etc., do not cover the term *vazpitanie* completely, neither in the sense of the 9th century and forward, nor in the present day. It is not possible to collect material from all early Old Bulgarian texts, nor is this the scope of the study; however, some of the published and well-known witnesses and dictionaries will be used for our purposes. According to the *Bulgarian Etymological Dictionary* (BER1: 204, also referring to the verb *pitaya*, BER5: 266–267 and its compounds, see further;) the noun *vazpitanie* derives from the verb *vazpitavam*/въспитѣти, възпитѣѣж, възпитѣѣши/въспитати, възпитатѣж, възпитатѣши in Old Bulgarian (LM 105; MDSJA1: 413; SJS1: 330; SR1: 282), and has the following meanings:

1) ‘to evolve moral qualities in someone’, ‘to habituate’, ‘to (get) accustom to’, ‘to train’, ‘to school’, ‘to inure to something’, ‘to teach/train/accustom someone to be orderly’; ‘train someone to discipline’, ‘to inculcate discipline/order into someone’; ‘to learn myself’, ‘to train/teach oneself to’; ‘to inure oneself’, ‘to become inured to’;

2) the participle *въспитанъ* (in English: ‘well-bred’, ‘well brought-up’, ‘well-mannered’, (for a male) ‘gentlemanlike’, ‘gentlemanly’; (for a female ladylike), (used in the *Chronicle of Manasses*, a Bulgarian translation from the 14th century by the order of King Ivan (John) Alexander, 1331–1371). The noun that originated the term *vazpitanie* is the Old Bulgarian noun *въспитание*/въспитѣние (LM 105; MDSJA1: 413; SJS1: 330; SR1: 282) ‘creation’, ‘being’, ‘posterity’, ‘offspring’, ‘progeny’, ‘generation’: *възкъ мое възпитание съвѣдаетъ* – ‘a wolf eats my animals/cattle/sheep’ (*Codex Suprasliensis*, 247. 19, translating the Gr. θρέμμα (from τρέφω); Lat. pecus (TLL2: 110–111; LRS: 735; LBR: 493) ‘charge’, ‘pupil’, ‘inmate’, ‘cattle’, ‘livestock’, ‘creature’; and used as well in the *Chronicle of Manasses*). As for the *Didactic Gospel*, it translates ἀνατροφή – ‘feeding’, ‘livelihood’, ‘upbringing a child/an animal’ (UE1: 194). When we discuss the verb, it usually translates the Greek analogs: (ἀνα)τρέφω, ἐκτρέφω, τεκνοτρέφω, παιδαγωγέω, συντρέφω – ‘to feed’, ‘to take care of a child/a living’, ‘to feed a child/a living’, ‘to teach/train/accustom a child/a living’; in Latin ‘(e)nutrio’, ‘filios/filias educo’ ‘to feed (a child/a living)’, ‘to take care of a child/a living’, ‘to teach/train/accustom sons/daughters/livings to something’. *Въспитание* and *въспитати* derive from the verb: *питати*, *питатѣж*, *питатѣши* (сѧ)/*питѣти*, *питѣѣж*, *питѣѣши* (LM 565; MDSJA2: 942; SJS3: 41–42; SR2: 211); (In Greek it translates in most cases τρέφω that still means: ‘to nourish’, ‘to entertain (myself)’, ‘to feel (myself)’, ‘to foster (myself)’) (UE1: 447) that has its correspondences in other Balkan, Eastern Slavic and other languages, as we shall see. The Greek verb by itself, on the other hand, is translated with a variety of Old Bulgarian verbs, such as *въскръзмити*, *въспитѣти*, *напитати*, *напитѣти*, *питѣти* (сѧ), *от питати* (сѧ), which all mean more or less ‘to feed’, ‘to give food to someone’ or ‘to take care of someone/something by giving food’ (UE2:

430). It is the main verb *πιτατι* and its derivatives,² of course, that are of a peculiar interest to us which need further investigation: in the Eastern Slavic witness they mean: ‘to feed (myself)’, ‘to bring (myself) food’, ‘to receive funds for living’, ‘to feel well-fed’ and even ‘to enjoy a luxurious life’. The last is attested with other words, such as *питание/питѣние*; Gr. *τροφή, σιτοποιία, σπατάλη*; Lat. *alimonia* (LRS: 57; LBR: 40 ‘maintenance’), *lautitia* (LRS: 582; LBR: 379 ‘delicacy’), *nutrimentum* (LRS: 683; LBR: 453 ‘food’), *pabulum* (LRS: 716; LBR: 480 ‘food’, ‘animal food’)(LM 565; MDSJA2: 941; SJS3: 42; SR2: 210) in the *Miscellany of 1073*, ordered by Tsar Simeon the Great, which is the first Bulgarian compendium for the Christian salvation of the soul, such as: (SS2: 123; SK: 88; SS3: 291; 41c 25–41d3): Οἷον τὰ τῶν κοσμικῶν κατορθώματα πλοῦτος ἐστὶ καὶ δόξα, καὶ δυναστεία, καὶ τρυφή (‘refinement’, ‘delicacy’), καὶ εὐσαρκία, καὶ εὐτεκνία καὶ τὰ ὅμοια, εἰς ἅπερ ὁ μοναχὸς ἀπώλετο – мирьскыи хъ сътъ оуправления богаѣство и слава и сила и питаниа и добродѣтельство и доброудие и подобнаа въ нѣже пришьдъ ѡрнѣць погыбнетъ – ‘The successes of the laity are wealth and fame, and dominion, and refinement, and a healthy body, and happiness with children, and the like. If a priest achieves them, he is doomed.’; (SS2: 123; SK: 107; SS3: 347; 55c 19–27): οἱ γυναῖξι συνεζευγμένοι καὶ ἀπὸ στρήνους καὶ σπατάλης (‘fashion, lasciviousness’ (LSJ: 1625)), καὶ μᾶλλον ἀφοβίας θεοῦ, καταλιπόντες αὐτάς καὶ εἰς ἀκαθαρσίας, καὶ παρὰ φύσιν συμφυρόμενοι – иже съ женами съпращени и отъ сверѣпиа и питаниа паге же отъ невоазни бѣиа оставляюще я и въ нечистоты ѡрѣсъ неѣство влѣзаште – ‘these, who are married with wives, and by arrogance and loose-morals, and more by not fearing God, are leaving them and unite (with others) in filth and unnatural.’; (SS2: 123; SK: 301; SS3: 941; 198d 15–20): Οὕτω καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι τὰ μέγιστα εἰργάσαντο κακὰ ἀπὸ τῆς μέθης καὶ τῆς τρυφῆς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν – такожде и же и юудѣи велико сътвориша отъ пыанетва зло и отъ питаниа на безаконие излѣзше – ‘Thus the Jews committed the greatest evils, carried away by drunkenness and the splendour of crime.’(see Ex. 32: 6). This *Miscellany* was translated from a Greek original anthology with excerpts of wise words from 450 excerpts from more than 40 authors and works for the salvation of the highly educated Christian soul (SK: 12). It is quite the opposite of the basic *vazpitanie* at home, at the primary school, or in the monastic center. Lavishness and splendour were considered bad manners, an indication of immorality and overacting, and, respectively, not suitable for the good Christian, the priest or the monk. During the Middle Ages, education in Europe was heavily influenced and controlled by Christianity and by Orthodox and Catholic priests, who held a monopoly on accepted knowledge and curricula. Monasteries and church schools were the primary educational institutions, but their nature differed between the capital and the provinces (Istoriya: 76). There were royal and monastic scriptoria with their schools, and disciples were gathered according to their social status (the children of nobility received better education, while the commoners were taught only simple things); in most cases, parents paid with food to provide for their offspring and the school as a whole. Orphans were usually cared for by the local church or a monastery and prepared for the priesthood, which included basic training in obedience, writing, and reading. There, they would receive basic, but essential skills that could help them later in life.

The early Bible translation suggests a different story: (Gen. 6: 19–20): εἰσάξεις εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν, ἵνα τρέφῃς μετὰ σεαυτοῦ· ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ ἔσονται. ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ὀρνέων τῶν πετεινῶν κατὰ γένος, καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κτηνῶν κατὰ γένος καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐρπετῶν

² They include *питательникъ* ‘feeder’, *питательнъ* ‘feeding’, *питва* ‘feast’, *питовати* ‘feed’, *питомъ* Gr. *σιτευτός*; Lat. *saginat* (Miklosich 1845: 62; LRS: 893; LBR: 621, SR2 210: ‘well-fed’, ‘fat’), *питомъць* ‘alumnus’, ‘alumna’, *пица* ‘food’, etc. (LM 565–567; MDSJA2: 942, 944; SJS3: 41–43; SR2 211; UE1: 447).

τῶν ἐρπόντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένος αὐτῶν, δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάντων εἰσελεύσονται πρὸς σὲ τρέφεσθαι μετὰ σοῦ – ВЪВЕДЪШИ ВЪ КОВЧЕГЪ ∷ ДА ПИТАЕШИ СЪ СОБОА ∷ МЖЖЪСКЪ ПОЛЪ И ЖЕНЪСКЫИ ∷ ДА БѢДЖЪТЪ ∷ Ѡ ВЪСАХЪ ПТИЦЪ НА РОДЪ ∷ И Ѡ ВЪСЪХЪ СКОТЪ НА РОДЪ ∷ И Ѡ ВЪСЪХЪ ГАДЪ ПРІАСМЫКААЩІИХЪ СЯ ПО ЗЕМИ НА РОДЪ ИХЪ ∷ БѢ∷БѢ Ѡ ВЪСЪХЪ ВНИДЖ КЪ ТЕБЯ ∷ ПИТАТИ СЯ СЪ ТОВОА – ‘shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep *them* alive with thee; they shall be male and female. Of fowls after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, two of every *sort* shall come unto thee, to keep *them* alive.’ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 127; Ribarova 2014: 268); (Mt. 6: 26): ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τρέφει αὐτά: – НЕ СЪЖИТЬ, НИ ЖЫИЖТЬ, НИ СЪВЖИРАЖТЬ ВЪ ЖИТЬНИЦѢ, И ОЦЬ ВАШЪ НЕБЕСЬНЫИ ПИТАЕЪТЪ Я – ‘for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them’ (in the early Glagolitic Gospels and in *Ostromir Gospels*, the oldest dated Russian manuscript book that was created in 1056 or 1057; LM: 565–565; MDSJA2: 942; SJS3: 41–42; SR2: 211). It is also given as a synonym of ВЪСПИТЪТИ/ВЪСПИТАТИ: (Jonah 4: 10) καὶ εἶπε Κύριος: σὺ ἐφείσω ὑπὲρ τῆς κολοκύνθης, ὑπὲρ ἧς οὐκ ἔκακοπάθησας ἐπ’ αὐτήν οὐδὲ ἐξέθρεψας αὐτήν, ἢ ἐγενήθη ὑπὸ νύκτα – И РѢ ГЪ ТЫ ОУВО СКР ВЕНЪ БЫ В ТЫКВИ ∷ W НЕИЖЕ НЕ ТРОУДІ СЯ НА НА ∷ НІ ВЪСПИТА А ∷ ЪЖЕ WБ НОЦЪ РОДИ СЯ – ‘Then said the LORD, Thou hast had pity on the gourd, for the which thou hast not laboured, neither madest it grow; which came up in a night’ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 333; Ribarova 2014: 112). Gr. τρέφω (*Codex Suprasliensis*, f.180), and it was used in the early Gospels: (Luke 4: 16) καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Ναζαρέτ, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος – И ПРИДЕ ВЪ НАЗАРЕТЪ ВЪ НЕМЪЖЕ БѢ ВЪСПИТЪНЪ – ‘And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up’ (*Codex Marinus*). The article in the dictionary by Sreznevskij (MDSJA2: 942) also provides the following references of the usage of the word in other languages: in Gothic: fōdjan ‘to feed’, ‘to nourish’, ‘to bring up’; in Old German: Futter ‘forage’, ‘animal food’; and in Greek: πάτεομαι (a synonym of τρέφω – ‘to taste’, ‘to eat’). There is another less common derivative verb with a slight variation: ВЪСПИТЪВАТИ, ВЪСПИТЪВАИЖ, ВЪСПИТЪВАЕШИ (LM 105; MDSJA1: 413; SJS1: 330), Gr. ἐκτρέφω; Lat. enutrio, which occurs in an early witness: (Pr. 23: 24) καλῶς ἐκτρέφει πατὴρ δίκαιος, ἐπὶ δὲ υἱῷ σοφῷ εὐφραίνεται ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ – ДОБРЕ ВЪСПИТАВАЕТЪ WЦЪ ПРАВЕНЪ ∷ W СІЪ ЖЕ ПРЪМЖДРЕ ВЕСЕЛИТЪ СЯ ДІІА ЕГО – ‘The father of the righteous shall greatly rejoice: and he that begetteth a wise *child* shall have joy of him’ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 249; Ribarova 2014: 112). There are dozens of similar examples. The last example is a rather peculiar one, but it is going to present our point of view and summarize the entire study. (Gen. 14: 14) ἀκούσας δὲ Ἀβραμ ὅτι ἠχμαλώτευται Λὼτ ὁ ἀδελφίδους αὐτοῦ, ἠρίθμησε τοὺς ἰδίους οἰκογενεῖς αὐτοῦ – СЛЫШАВЪ АВРАМЪ ∷ ЪКО ПЛЪНЕНЪ БЫ ЛОТЪ БРАТЪ ЕГО ∷ И ЙУТЕ (from ичисти i.e. ‘counted’) АДЪУАДЕЦЪ СВОИХЪ ‘οἰκογενής’; ‘home born (servant, slave)’ ∷ ‘And when Abram heard that his brother was taken captive, he armed his trained *servants*.’ The lexeme ЯДЪУАДЫЦЪ, with a spelling variation ЯДЪУАДИНЪ, ‘servant’, ‘slave’, occurred for the first time in *Prophetologion Grigorovichianum*, 13th century. It is interesting to note that in the other two early *Prophetologia Lobkoviani Zacharianique* (Dynda, Stankovska 2024: 55), there is the lexeme ДОМОУАДЫЦЪ (LM: 171; MDSJA1: 699) ‘household’, ‘family’ is used, but more or less they are synonymous in sense they are chosen (LM: 1167; MDSJA3: 1643; Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: 384–385; Ribarova 2014: 400). Both are rare lexemes, found in these witnesses for the first time. In Antiquity and in the Middle Ages, it was quite common for a master to possess and raise several servants and slaves (or both) in his house and to train and mould them to work or do specific activities, according to the needs of his household. This included, of course, feeding, training, and even teaching the human ‘livestock’ different jobs that were required in the domain. In many cases, their children continued their parents’ occupations, and sometimes a

family and its 'household' would live together in symbiosis for generations. In this specific case, obviously, the servants were also prepared to obey their master as a private paramilitary squad if required.

To conclude what we found so far:

1) the Old Bulgarian perception of *vazpitanie* was the concept of feeding and taking care of the child, slaves, servants, progenies, cattle, livestock, etc. All of them were essential for the human's life – to prolong the family, feed it, and provide it with the basic necessities for living. They were all needed for cycle of life for the whole family that included everyone that the master/father had to take care of;

2) the most common Greek radix, and it must be underlined, is predominantly one and namely τρεφ-/τροφ- (feed/food);

3) hence, to understand completely this specific concept for the Bulgarian way of thinking, we must take into account this Greek radix and its correlation with the Old Bulgarian ones ПИТАТИ/ВЪСПИТАТИ;

4) additional proof of the last statement can be found in Latin which can also provide solid base for pointing out a correct and somewhat rightful translation in English of the term *vazpiatnie*.

In Latin, as we saw, there are numerous lexemes for education, training, teaching, upbringing, etc. In order to conclude this investigation of words and radices from various languages, a specific case is needed to find the 'missing link' among the Greek, Latin, Old Bulgarian and English. The first and by far the most intriguing is the lexeme 'alumnus/alumna' (TLL1: 105–106; LRS: 62; LBR: 43), deriving from the Latin verb *alo* (TLL1: 100; LRS: 60; LBR: 42) – 'to feed (up)', 'to support', 'to strengthen'. It has the same meaning in English and summarizes the process of receiving a degree in a prestigious educational institution where one not only studies but also achieves the required nourishment on how to behave properly, so that he/she can be called a student of that institution. In modern Bulgarian, there are two terms that directly correspond to the Latin and English lexemes: *vazpitanik* and *pitomets*, which derive from the Old Bulgarian ВЪСПИТАТИ and ПИТОМЪЦЪ (see above). In other languages, the same words are used with the same meaning and describe the graduate of a certain school or institution – in Modern Russian, *воспитанник* (Slovar1: 163; Fasmer1: 357) and *питомец* (Slovar3: 221; Fasmer3: 269) – both derive from the Old Bulgarian words and mean a graduate of a certain school. In Serbian, these words are considered archaic, but the modern Serbian *васпитања/vaspitanja* remains in use with its old meaning (Danichih 1863: 187). *Vazpitanie* in Modern Greek is ανατροφή, while παιδεία stands for *obrazovanie* and εκπαίδευση for *obuchenie*. Even in Turkish, there are three distinct words for *obuchenie* – Öğretim, *obrazovanie* – Tahsil and *vazpitanie* – yetiştirme, although with the same blurring in sense, as in Bulgarian, and not connected to food (BTR: 106, 321, 323).

The Modern Bulgarian concepts *obuchenie*, *obrazovanie* and *vazpitanie* are derived directly from the Old Bulgarian common Slavonic verbs and their derivatives. Lately, there is no clear distinction among them, but etymologically and logically, it is still there. All of them demonstrate a specific approach towards life and can be somewhat explained or have their correlations predominantly in Greek and, to a lesser extent, in Latin. One can be 'skilled in', 'good at' something, because he/she went through a course of *obuchenie*, crafts, art, etc., another can be 'well-educated', because he/she has a certain degree in education or knowledge in some sphere, which is *obrazovanie*. Last, but not least, one can know how to survive, have some skills, but be 'ill-mannered' at the same time. *Vazpitanie* is a process that begins at home, within the child's immediate circle, and is linked to feeding and timing. It fosters discipline, manners, proper speech, and even the acquisition of a second/third language, and prepares the child for further interaction with society. It does not exclude the initial forms of pedagogical

facilities, such as nurseries or kindergartens, where the individual's development is enriched by interaction with similar others. *Vazpitanie* is the first, but in a sense, the most essential step of the evolvement, upbringing and preparation for the next level of the person self-improvement.

The aforementioned is evident also within the use of the corresponding terms in the English language. Firstly, the broader terms will be reviewed, starting with the encompassing term 'pedagogy'. The Oxford English Dictionary states that the earliest recorded use of the word 'pedagogy' in the English language was in 1571. The word entered English via the 16th-century French term *pédagogie*, itself derived from the Latin *paedagogia* and the Greek *παιδαγωγία*, both meaning 'education' or 'providing care for children.' These terms originated from the Greek *παιδαγωγός*, meaning 'teacher'³. In English, the term was initially employed to denote 'a place of instruction; a school, a college; a university;' however, it was also used figuratively. In contemporary usage, this meaning is regarded as 'historical and rare' (OED). From 1583 to 1713, the term was employed to denote 'instruction, discipline, training; a system of introductory training; a means of guidance.' This usage has since become obsolete. The definition that has been widely accepted from 1623 to the present is as follows: 'the art, occupation, or practice of teaching,' and 'the theory or principles of education; a method of teaching based on such a theory' (OED). In contemporary society, Pedagogy is a university specialty, frequently encountered in bachelor's programmes, wherein prospective educators partake in their pre-service training. Pedagogy, in this sense, is the scientific study of education, encompassing its fundamental principles, structural elements, dimensions, content, methodologies, and the dynamics of teaching and learning. It also includes analysing knowledge transmission and identifying effective learning strategies, while taking into account the broader educational environment. Pedagogy is the theory and practice of teaching and learning, encompassing the teacher's role, including their attitudes, values, and professional conduct. Furthermore, it considers students' cognitive, emotional, and social development, emphasising the importance of motivation, engagement, and individual needs.

The confusion often observed between the terms education and formation is also reflected in the ambiguity surrounding pedagogy, which is at times regarded as a near-synonym for education (as in both teaching and learning and formation). An example is the translation of the Bulgarian Faculty of Pedagogy, which is rendered as the Faculty of Education.

The distinction between the terms used for teaching and learning and for formation has existed since antiquity, when these terms were first formulated. In ancient Greek society, a clear distinction existed between the roles of pedagogues (*paidagōgoi*, *παιδαγωγοί*) and subject teachers (*didaskaloi*, *διδάσκαλοι*). The pedagogue held a higher status because of his role in providing moral guidance, a function parents considered more important than academic instruction. While the schoolmaster's role was exclusively focused on teaching literacy, the pedagogue was responsible for the child's moral and social development. Despite being enslaved, the pedagogue was an integral member of the household and well-versed in its values and the father's authority. Moreover, the pedagogue maintained close, daily contact with the child – a privilege the schoolmaster did not share (Shah 2021).

The term education has been understood as polysemic since its first appearance, encompassing meanings such as teaching and learning, formation, training, and more (Moreira 2025). In Old English, the modern concept of education as structured schooling did not exist. Instead, a variety of terms with related meanings were employed, including *læran* ('to teach, instruct, guide'), *tæcan* ('to show, demonstrate, instruct') and *byrnan* ('to bring up, rear, nourish'), all of which describe aspects of developing knowledge, skills and character⁴.

³ <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=pedagogy>

⁴ <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=education>

Nevertheless, no single word can encapsulate the comprehensive notion of education as currently conceptualised (i.e., as a synergy among teaching, learning, and formation, and as a specific level of acquired knowledge). Following the Norman Conquest, Middle English initially retained terms such as *lering* (from Old English *læran*) and *tæchen* (from *tæcan*). Over time, however, it increasingly incorporated borrowings from Norman French and Latin, including the early form of the modern word education. The Middle French word education was used as inspiration: ‘action of bringing up a child concerning physical, mental, and spiritual development (a1380; rare before 1527; French *éducation*),’ and the classical Latin *ēducātiō* – ‘rearing (of young), upbringing, nurture, (of animals)’ (OED). By the close of the Middle English period, these borrowed terms had become more prevalent, especially in formal and courtly settings (Ibid.). The first documented use of the word education in the English language dates from the 1530s, with the initial meaning of ‘child-rearing’ and ‘training of animals,’ mainly referring to cultivating social and moral norms in children⁴.

The English verb ‘to educate’ traces back to the mid-fifteenth-century term *educatem*, meaning ‘to bring up (children), to train’. This word was derived from the Latin *educatus*, the past participle of *educare*, which means ‘to bring up, rear, educate’. *Educatus* also gave rise to related terms in other languages, such as *educar* (Portuguese and Spanish), *educare* (Italian), and *éduquer* (French). Additionally, the verb ‘to educate’ is linked to the Latin *educere*, meaning ‘to bring out, lead forth’⁴. The Oxford English Dictionary provides 4 main definitions of the term education.

- The earliest one is as follows: ‘the process of bringing up a child, with reference to forming character, shaping manners and behaviour, etc.; the manner in which a person has been brought up,’ used since 1527 up to the present era, although today the meaning is rare, or assimilated into the 4th definition.
- The second one, dating from 1533–1822, describes education as ‘the process of looking after a person or animal with respect to food and other physical needs; esp. the nurturing or rearing of a child or young animal; an instance or a method of this.’
- The third definition states that education is ‘the culture or development of personal knowledge or understanding, growth of character, moral and social qualities, etc., as contrasted with the imparting of knowledge or skill,’ used often ‘with modifying words, as intellectual education, moral education, etc.’ It has been in use since 1533.
- The fourth definition is divided into three separate meanings:
 - a) ‘The systematic instruction, teaching, or training in various academic and non-academic subjects given to or received by a child, typically at a school; the course of scholastic instruction a person receives in his or her lifetime; instruction or training given to or received by an adult.’ It has been in use since 1536;
 - b) ‘The training of an animal.’ It has been in use since 1538;
 - c) ‘Instruction or enlightenment as imparted by a particular thing, circumstance, etc.; an educating force or experience.’ It has been in use since 1762.

In the contemporary world, the fourth definition (a) is the most commonly recognised and used in educational contexts. It is noteworthy that the word education is listed among the 500 most common words in modern written English (OED). This fact alone underscores the importance of education, as a scientific field, in shaping future generations and developing resilient and sustainable societies. It also outlines the importance of a deep, comprehensive understanding of the term.

The etymological analysis and review of the provided definitions demonstrate that education has been viewed, perceived, and understood in different ways throughout history. Its essence has been intertwined with a diverse range of expected outcomes, which, in turn, are intertwined with societal requirements for younger generations. It is intriguing to note that

education was first understood primarily as a formational process, as evidenced by the initial three definitions in the OED. The third is particularly pertinent to contemporary understandings of the term 'formation' (cultivation, upbringing, development), or, more precisely, the Bulgarian term *vazpitanie*, which encompasses all of the aforementioned concepts. This term is employed to signify the differentiation of formation from education, and it specifies different types (content fields) of formation – intellectual, moral, intercultural, aesthetic, etc. – all possible aspects and dimensions in which a person could form and develop.

As previously discussed, the term education encompasses a range of meanings, referring either to the realm of teaching and learning or to formation. One such term is teaching, which, unlike education, has its roots in Old English. The word was inherited from Germanic, with the Old English variant being *tæcan*, *tæcean* (OED). The Old English past tense *tæht(e)* underwent a process of vowel shortening before two consonants, resulting in the Early Middle English form *tahte*. Subsequently, the form *taught* emerged dialectally as *taut(e)* by the 13th century. Nonetheless, a long-vowel form (e.g., *tæhte*, *têhte*) also survived until approximately 1300. The mention of teaching dates back as early as 1297, when it was used as a verb with prepositional complements (to teach of; to teach to) – 'to train to, to accustom to the use or practice of' – now an obsolete usage (Ibid.). Among the other older meanings of the verb 'teach' are: 'to show, present or offer to view' (Old English); 'to show (a person) the way; to direct, conduct, convoy, guide; to send away; to direct or refer (to something)' (Old English – 1500); 'to show what is to be observed or done; to direct, appoint, prescribe, decree, enjoin' (Old English – 1567). The leading definition, 'to show by way of information or instruction,' has been in use since the days of Old English. Additionally, the word is described in a more specific manner: 'to impart or convey the knowledge of; to give instruction or lessons in (a subject); to make known, deliver (a message),' also 'to communicate something to a person, by way of instruction; to inform;' 'to impart knowledge to, give instruction to; to inform, instruct, educate, train, school;' 'to communicate knowledge; to act as a teacher; to give instruction' (OED). The usage of the noun also dates back to Old English, with mentions from 1175 – 'the imparting of instruction or knowledge; the occupation or function of a teacher,' 1300 – 'that which is taught; a thing taught, doctrine, instruction, precept,' and 1400 – 'showing the way; direction, guidance' (obsolete) (Ibid.).

As demonstrated by the provided definitions, teaching has historically been understood as the process of one individual imparting knowledge to another. The term is thus associated with the teacher's role and, more specifically, with the process of sharing facts, data, information, knowledge, skills, know-how, and related resources. Another term used to describe the teacher's role (educator, facilitator, instructor, or information sharer) is instruction. The word has multiple origins and influences from French and Latin: from Anglo-Norman and Middle French *instruction*, meaning authoritative order (in 1320, Old French), teaching or education (from a1373), lesson (a1380), and information (early 15th century or earlier) (OED); and the Greek, Latin and Old Bulgarian roots, mentioned above. The earliest documented use of the term in English, specifically within the context of education, dates back to 1425, as evidenced by the following definition: 'that which is taught; knowledge or authoritative guidance imparted by one person to another; a thing taught; a lesson; an informative or edifying rule or example' (OED). Subsequently, in 1439, the following usage emerged: 'the action, practice, or profession of teaching; the imparting of knowledge, skill, or information; the fact of being taught; education, training' (Ibid.). Both meanings remain in use in modern English and convey the idea of an individual sharing, demonstrating, or transmitting information, skills, etc. As with the term teaching, instruction also pertains to the educator's role and functions of informing, teaching, and guiding children.

Similarities can be identified between the terms teaching and instruction, and the term training, which is derived from the Old French term *trainer*, meaning ‘to drag, draw.’ Initially associated with physical conditioning and skill development, it has since come to encompass systematic preparation for specific roles or competencies⁵. The first registered mentions, related specifically to ‘improvement or development,’ as opposed to hunting, moving, direction, etc., date back to the 1400s: ‘to direct, treat, or manipulate to bring to a necessary or desired form’ and ‘to subject to discipline and instruction for development of character, behaviour, or skill’ (OED). In 1531 emerged the meaning ‘to give sustained instruction and practice to in an art, profession, occupation, or procedure,’ in 1532 – ‘to teach (an animal) a particular behaviour, esp. to obey orders; to make (an animal) capable of performing a particular task or function,’ and in 1542 – ‘to teach behaviour or attitudes to; to educate, rear, bring up.’ The scope of the definitions expanded over time, with the term being used to describe the following actions by 1600: ‘to cultivate or develop (the mind, the spirit, a faculty, etc.), esp. for a specified purpose; to accustom to performing a specified function’, and in 1601 – ‘to follow a course of sustained practice and study in an art, profession, occupation, or procedure.’ In 1712, there was an observable reversion to a more fundamental principle. The prevailing concept of training as a process of shaping and refining an entity to its intended state transitioned into the notion of physical development – ‘to supervise (a person) in physical preparations for athletic or sporting competition, or in a programme to enhance fitness or bodily appearance.’ In 1806 that definition was expanded – ‘to pursue physical activity, and often a controlled diet, in preparation for athletic or sporting competition, or in a programme to enhance fitness or bodily appearance’ (OED). The noun is also related to senses in the aspect of education. A definition from 1537 explains that training is ‘discipline and instruction (given or received) for development of character, behaviour, or ability; education, rearing, bringing up,’ one from 1569 reviews it more concretely as ‘the action or process of training soldiers,’ and a formulation from 1581 relates it to the ‘physical preparation of oneself or another for athletic or sporting competition; engagement in a programme to enhance fitness or bodily appearance.’ Subsequent meanings were presented, including one from 1598, according to which training is a ‘sustained instruction and practice (given or received) in an art, profession, occupation, or procedure, with a view to proficiency in it,’ a formulation from 1677 that describes it as ‘the teaching of a particular behaviour, esp. obedience to orders, to an animal; the process of making an animal capable of performing a particular task or function, or the process by which an animal becomes capable of this,’ and the definition from 1794 – ‘a thorough education in a subject, profession, etc.’ (OED).

Another associated term, albeit one which is not widely used, particularly in the scientific literature regarding education, is the word *schooling*. The word was formed in English through conversation, but an equivalent can be found in post-classical Latin: *scholare*, to study, to be a student (OED). One of its first definitions, from 1456, states that schooling means ‘to educate or train (a person, the mind, etc.); to make wise, skillful, or tractable by training or discipline; (more generally) to impart wisdom or understanding to’ (Ibid.). Soon after that, in 1475, the word was used to describe the following: ‘to instruct or provide with instruction in (also about, to) a particular discipline, subject, activity, etc.; to train for a particular occupation or career’. In 1573 emerged a meaning, that is now colloquial: ‘to reprimand, scold, admonish; to tell (a person) he or she is wrong about something; to dictate to (a person); to criticize, correct, ‘lecture.’ Several more definitions are listed in the OED, for example: ‘to inform or advise on a particular matter; to make privy to pertinent information; to instruct (a person) how to act in a particular situation or how to do something’ (1577), ‘to educate (a child) at a school; to provide (a person) with a formal education, typically at a school, college, or

⁵ <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=training>

university' (1577), 'to bring oneself under control; to direct oneself to do something or into a particular state by a process of self-control; to bring into or out of a particular mood or state by self-discipline or determination' (1579), 'to be educated in a particular belief, habit, outlook, etc.' (1708), 'to attend school' (1857), 'to train (an animal, esp. a horse)' (1608). The noun is characterized by its own distinct set of meanings, which closely resemble those of the verb. The first definition is from 1440 and addresses schooling as 'the training or discipline of a person, the heart, etc., so as to shape character or behaviour; the imparting or receiving of wisdom, morality, or understanding (of a particular thing)' (OED). The 1449 formulation states that schooling can be defined as 'teaching, given or received, esp. in a school; the action of teaching or the fact of being taught; education; an act or instance of this; a period of education,' and the definition from 1785 describes it as 'the occupation or profession of teaching in a school; school teaching' (Ibid.).

Whilst the terms teaching, instruction, and training are connected to the role of the teacher, there are, of course, terms that pertain to the role of the student. The most popular term may be 'learning,' which is of Germanic origin and was recorded in Old English as *leornian*. The original meaning of this word was 'to follow a track' or 'to gain knowledge.' It emphasizes the learner's active acquisition of knowledge, skills, or understanding⁶. Another Old English definition portrays learning as 'the action or process of acquiring knowledge, understanding, or skill', also as 'scholarly knowledge or understanding, esp. of literature, philosophy, science, etc., acquired by systematic study; education; the possession of such knowledge; learnedness' (OED). Around the year 1390 the noun was also employed to convey the following meaning: 'a lesson; (in early use) esp. one which is learned or taught through instruction or education' and 'later (chiefly in plural): a fact, skill, insight, or other piece of knowledge; knowledge gained, esp. as a result of a particular experience, event, etc.' – a definition that is still in use today (Ibid.). It is interesting to note that in 1175, the word was used with the meaning 'to teach', and by around 1400, learning had come to signify the action or an act of teaching.' This formulation fell into disfavour in the early 19th century, as evidenced by the New English Dictionary (OED, first edition, 1902), which labelled it 'vulgar' (OED).

Several of the Old English definitions of the verb pertain to learning as an action in order 'to gain or acquire knowledge of or skill in (something) as a result of study, experience, or being taught', 'to receive instruction', 'to commit (something, such as a text, song, etc.) to memory'. In 1530, another definition emerged, related specifically to training animals: 'to gain skill or ability in (something) as a result of experience or being trained; to develop the capacity to do something'. Eighteen years later, in 1548, the following formulation appeared: 'to gain or acquire knowledge of something factual, esp. by receiving information from others', and in the 1800s – 'to develop the capacity, over a period of time, to behave or think differently in a given context; to change one's attitude in order to behave more wisely' (OED). In 1901, the psychological perspective interpreted learning as 'a mental process which leads to the modification of behaviour or the acquisition of new abilities or responses, and which is additional to natural development by growth or maturation and often contrasted with insight.' One of the phrases incorporating the word learning was first coined in 1916 in the United States and is intended to facilitate the learning of a particular skill, as in 'learn-to-read,' 'learn-to-ski,' or 'learn-to-swim' (Ibid.).

The second most common term, which refers to the acquisition of knowledge and the role of the learner, the student, is studying. The word is of multiple origins, with Latin (*studēre*) and French (*studier*, *estudier*) influences. Circa 1225, it meant 'to think intently; to meditate, reflect; to try to recollect something or come to a decision,' and in late Old English (1816) it

⁶ <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=learning>

was used to convey the following meaning: ‘to strive towards, direct one's efforts to, set one's mind on, devote oneself to’ (OED). Approximately 120 years later, during the 1300s, the definition encompassed the acquisition of information: ‘to devote time and effort to acquiring knowledge, esp. by means of written sources, observation, or experiment; to apply one's mind to learning,’ and in 1445, a shorter, on-point one emerged: ‘to devote time and effort to acquiring knowledge of (a science, art, language, etc.)’ (Ibid.). A mere 2 years later, the formulation was enriched: ‘to undertake a formal course of educational or professional study at a university, college, or the like; to be a student or learner for a specified qualification, etc., or under a specified teacher.’ Thereafter, the definitions started to outline the process in relation to school or university, the comprehensive understanding and exploration of a phenomenon and/or subjects: in 1530 – ‘to be a student of (a specific subject) at a university, college, etc.; to be occupied with as the subject of one's formal course of study or training,’ in 1528 – ‘to examine in detail; to try to understand or become minutely acquainted with (a phenomenon, state of circumstances, series of events, person's character, etc.); to investigate, look into,’ between 1659 and 1857 – ‘to exercise thought and deliberation upon (an action, composition, etc.),’ in 1616 – ‘to scrutinize (a visible object) in order to ascertain its nature or to interpret or become familiar with its appearance; to look at intently’ (OED).

A number of the documented rare or obsolete formulations are of interest. A noteworthy example is that, between 1569–1818, to study meant ‘to teach, educate; to be educated in, into (studied)’ (OED).

The terms for teaching (training, instruction) and learning (studying) have carried different meanings and reflected various perspectives across the centuries, evolving alongside cultural, social, and educational shifts. This historical diversity is likely to have contributed to their complex and layered contemporary constructs. In comparison, terms related to formation have also demonstrated variability, often showing even greater diversity due to their use across different professional, cultural, institutional, and philosophical spheres. Consequently, they have also evolved to acquire multifaceted and nuanced meanings in present-day educational discourse.

One of the most commonly used terms in the educational dimension, related to values, character, and behaviour building, is ‘formation’. The word stems from the Latin *formāre*, ‘to form,’ and, circa 1450, it signified the ‘action or process of forming; a putting or coming into form; creation, production’ of something (OED). In 1898, in the sphere of Ecology, the term gained the meaning of ‘a community formed by groups of plants which have adapted themselves to similar climatic conditions,’ a borrowing from the German word *formation*, as described in A. Grisebach 1838, in *Linnaea* XII. 160 (Ibid.). It is important to note that all other mentions of the word are not related to education, even in a figurative manner (the disposition of fibers in a sheet of paper, an arrangement of military troops, an assemblage of rocks, etc.). This raises questions and provides a basis for discussion, since ‘formation’ is frequently used to refer to the cultivation of norms, attitudes, beliefs, and more in younger generations. This is based on the notion that the qualities and values that define an individual are not merely acquired but rather ‘formed’ through a complex process of shaping, guidance, and integration into a coherent value system. This system, in turn, is explained and linked to an individual's behaviour projections in real life, with the objective of internalizing these qualities and values and perceiving them as integral components of one's personal identity, mindset, and worldview. When the elements in question are absent, they are first constructed; in both cases, the aim is to develop them and encourage the child to strive for continuous self-improvement.

Another term frequently used to describe the aforementioned process is upbringing – a word that is usually associated with education within the family environment⁷. The rationale behind this usage is most likely tied to the term's original definitions, established in English through derivation (OED). Similarities can be observed in the Old Frisian *opbringa*, (Middle) Dutch *opbrenge*, Middle Low German *upbringen* (Low German *upbrenge*), Middle High German *ûbringen* (German *aufbringen*), later Danish *opbringe*, and Swedish *uppbringa* (Ibid.). The word was used between 1297 and 1563 to denote the process of bringing up and rearing, and circa 1440, it also gained the meaning ‘to bring forth, produce.’ The obsolete, or rare definition – ‘the action of building’ (1484) could be figuratively connected to the building of values, skills, and beliefs; hence, related to the modern-day use of the term. It is estimated that around 1525, the sense that we now consign to upbringing was established: ‘the action of bringing up young persons; the fact of being brought up while young, or the manner of this; early rearing and training.’ This meaning was ‘rare in older English use, but common in Scottish in the second half of the 16th cent., and occasionally used by later Scottish writers’ and it is ‘in general use only from c1870’ (OED).

Closely related to upbringing, at least in the sense that it is typically understood in terms of the family environment (and the social environment), is the term *nurture*. It derives from the Anglo-Norman and Old French *noreture*, *norture*, *nurtoure*, *nurtur*, *nurture*, used mainly as *nurture* in the late 11th century in the sense of breeding cattle, and the late 13th century, meaning education (OED). The term is also well known in scientific discourse, particularly within psychology, pedagogy, and philosophy, where it denotes the debate over whether nature or nurture plays the more significant role in determining an individual's characteristics and behaviours (O Wright, 2022). Since its inception, the term has been employed primarily with this or analogous meanings, accentuating the environmental factors in human development, particularly the cultivation of moral and social qualities. The now rare definition, which emerged circa 1330, states that *nurture* is the process of ‘a person's breeding, upbringing, education, or training (in early use esp. in matters of behaviour and etiquette),’ with additional details: ‘the bringing up, rearing, or training of a person or animal, esp. a child; tutelage; care; the fact of having been brought up in a particular social environment (in later use esp. as a factor influencing or determining personality, as opposed to a person's innate characteristics)’ (OED). There are also obsolete formulations, one of which refers to *nurture* as the ‘nurture of a child, a child being cared for, being in one's care,’ and the second one, used between 1526 and 1684, ‘moral training or discipline.’ Since 1450, the definitions have remained predominantly focused on the original sense, with sporadic exceptions, like the one circa 1520, which accentuates only one of the aspects of nourishment, namely, ‘to discipline, chasten; to punish’ (Ibid.). Within the 1450 formulation, the term *nurture* is viewed as a set of actions intended to mean ‘to feed or nourish (a child, animal, etc.); to support and raise to maturity; to rear.’ By circa 1475, the term had been shortened and made more specific, being defined as ‘to train, educate.’ Thereafter, the term assumed a more expansive significance, as evidenced by its definition in 1780, which characterised *nurture* as ‘the careful fostering, cultivation, or encouraging of something,’ and one from 1792, describing the term as ‘to care for and encourage the growth or development of; to foster, cultivate; to cherish or treasure within oneself (a hope, feeling, etc.)’ (OED).

Other terms, which are utilised to describe the formation of one's personality, also exist, but they were originally meant to define other, different phenomena, processes, and actions. Such are the terms *cultivation*, *breeding*, and *refinement*. The first one, *cultivation*, was ‘either a borrowing from Latin (*cultivat-*, *cultivare*), combined with an English element,’ or ‘a borrowing from French (*cultivation*)’ (OED). The term has undergone various definitions over

⁷ <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/upbringing>

time, most of which relate to the care of land, crops, and animals. One such definition, dating back to 1553, states that cultivation is ‘the action or an act of preparing and using the land for growing crops; tillage; the state or condition of being cultivable or cultivated land’ (Ibid.). Another one, from 1791, portrays it as ‘the raising or improvement of animals’ (Ibid.). The logical progression from agricultural nuances to educational (formational) ones can be traced back to the concept of caring for a child and developing them, much like (even though not identical, of course) the cultivation of land and the training of animals. In the context of child development, parents (or educators) are responsible for the process of formation. They prepare the child, set the rules, organise the environment and their actions and influences, consider carefully their goals and methods, and implement them until they see a result.

Intermingled with the agricultural definitions are several senses of the word that demonstrate a more direct association with the process of formation. The first one is from 1622 – ‘the action of refining or improving a person, the mind, faculties, etc., by education or training;’ a few years later emerges another one – ‘the devotion of special attention or study to (the development of) an activity, branch of knowledge, etc.’ (1639); and in 1662 – ‘the condition of being cultivated; culture, refinement’ (Ibid.). In 1737, an interesting specific perspective is noted: ‘the action of developing, or trying to develop, a friendship or relationship,’ which is not directly related to the process of formation, but does cover an aspect of it, namely – the enhancement of social and personal aptitudes necessary for establishing the basis for constructive relationships.

The term breeding is understood to have had a different original meaning, although its primary sense is still related, at least in part, to the development of the child. In essence, the term describes the process of producing and raising offspring. (Old English, OED). The word’s origins are Germanic, and its cognate terms are: ‘Middle Dutch broeden, brueden, broeien – to produce (offspring), to hatch (eggs), to nurture, to care for (Dutch broeden, broeien), Middle Low German brōden, broden – to produce (offspring), to nurture, Old High German bruoten – to warm, to keep warm, to produce (offspring), to nurture, care for (Middle High German brüeten, German brüten)’ (Ibid.). The word nurture is present in some of the meanings, and this pertains to the notion that breeding could also be used to describe an aspect of the process of formation. Subsequently, alternative definitions emerged, deviating from those associated with procreation and reproductive processes, and instead focusing on education (formation). The first one is from 1447 and portrays breeding as a process during which the goal is ‘to educate (a person); to provide (a person) with instruction, esp. at a school, university, or other place of education.’ The definition from 1577 connects breeding with upbringing: ‘the bringing up of children; the raising of a person from childhood; upbringing,’ and with teaching: ‘education; training, instruction,’ combining the fundamental educational dimensions into one formulation. Several years later, the meaning of the word was specified, directed mostly towards formation: ‘to bring (a person) up; to raise (a person) from childhood in a particular way, providing guidance and direction about behaviour, religion, social position, tradition, etc.’ (1595); this tendency continued in 1600s, with the emergence of the following definition: ‘good manners and courteous behaviour resulting from a good upbringing, traditionally or stereotypically regarded as characteristic of people of high social class, or as intrinsic to that class’ (OED). The latter formulation describes breeding more like a noun and allows for an intriguing observation – stereotypes and prejudices can be observed within certain educational terms, as some of them were used to specify the educational status (including formational: manners, social skills, personal characteristics) of a concrete class of people.

The listed definitions also permit a conclusion regarding the meaning of the word, specifically in the formative realm of education. The concept of breeding can be understood as a combination of upbringing and cultivation, referring to the synergy between socially approved

behaviour, good manners, and adherence to social and moral norms, and the development of cultural and socio-emotional characteristics.

The third word to be considered is refinement, which, although it emerged with a different meaning, can still be related to the concept of formation. It was ‘formed within English, by derivation’ and can be compared to the ‘Middle French refinement (1469, with reference to sugar production), French raffinement (1600), and the Italian raffinamento (1599)’ (OED). In 1611, a general definition was proposed, stating that refinement is ‘the process of refining or purifying something; the result of refining, or an instance of this; the state of being refined.’ The 1659 formulation described the term as ‘the improvement, modification, or clarification of a faculty, product, mechanism, etc., esp. by way of a series of small changes,’ and the 1703 sense was linked to ‘the refining of a substance or product; esp. the removing of impurities or unwanted elements by some process, or series of processes’ (Ibid.). These definitions lead to the conclusion that the word was used in a formative context, given its figurative associations: to refine someone, indicating the process of making them more cultured, ‘polished,’ and socially sophisticated. Concurrently, formulations of this nature also emerged. In 1692, for instance, the term refinement was employed to denote ‘an act of refining in thought, reasoning, or discourse; the result of this; a piece of subtle, or oversubtle, reasoning; a subtlety, a fine distinction,’ a meaning that is now rare. In 1704, it was defined as ‘fineness of feeling, taste, or thought; cultured elegance in behaviour or manner; sophisticated and superior good taste,’ and in 1683, it was reviewed as ‘a feature, custom, or thing indicative of refined manners, feelings, or taste’ (Ibid.).

In summary, it is evident that the terminology employed in relation to education, as the formation of values, attitudes, and beliefs, is less extensive and less precisely defined than the terminology regarding teaching and learning. The interrelations between the two processes are observable within the formulations. The teaching/learning definitions are, to a certain extent, related to formation, and the formational ones occasionally incorporate components that necessitate teaching, training, or instruction. Nevertheless, a clear distinction is evident. The formational ones are oriented toward the development of values, skills, perspectives, attitudes, emotions, and more, whereas the teaching/learning ones are oriented toward knowledge acquisition.

Discussion

The analysis of the results enables the formulation of important conclusions and answers the posited research questions.

What are the main terms used in the English language related to the field of education (in the aspect of teaching, learning, and formation)?

The summarized results for the most frequently employed terms in the educational discourse, in the aspect of teaching and learning, are presented in Table 1.

Term	Scope
Education	Systematic schooling, knowledge, skills; a synergy between teaching and learning and formation; a degree, level of acquired knowledge and expertise. Considered the ‘umbrella’ term, incorporating the other ones.
Instruction	The deliberate act, sustained practice, or specialized occupation of facilitating learning; the transmission and sharing of knowledge, information, or data; the experience of receiving instruction; the broader processes of education and skill development. Frequently used as a synonym for teaching.

Term	Scope
Teaching	Communicating something by way of instruction; providing information in a methodical, coherent, and accessible manner; presenting facts and data and facilitating their retention, assimilation, and comprehension; imparting knowledge; providing instruction; developing transversal and real-life applicable skills. Used mostly in the context of knowledge, including specific subject/science knowledge, skills, and information.
Training	Continued instruction and practice, given or received, in a skill or profession, aimed at gaining proficiency; physical preparation for sports or fitness improvement, enhancement of bodily appearance. Often associated with practical skills, used in vocational education and/or non-formal education.
Schooling	Providing instruction, teaching, given or received, in a school environment; education; a specific period of education; the profession or occupation of educating others in a school environment; school teaching.
Learning	The acquisition of knowledge or skills through study, experience, or instruction; a mental process that alters behaviour and/or develops new abilities or responses.
Studying	To dedicate time and effort to learning, particularly through reading, observation, or experimentation; to focus mentally on gaining knowledge; to pursue a specific subject as part of formal education or training at a university, college, or similar institution.

The first set of the presented terms reveals a sophisticated ecosystem of interconnected concepts that operate across different dimensions of human development and knowledge acquisition. These terms constitute a hierarchical structure, with education serving as the overarching concept, while the remaining terms function as specialised components within this broader framework. Education is defined as the most comprehensive term, explicitly described as the concept that encompasses all others. This positioning is significant because it suggests that education represents a holistic process that integrates cognitive, practical, and formational dimensions. The term's essence emphasises the combination of teaching and learning, and formation, indicating that education is not a linear process but a dynamic, interactive phenomenon.

While education represents the totality of structured learning and development, instruction focuses on the act of delivering knowledge or guiding learning. It is deliberate and often formal, aligning closely with the role of a facilitator. Teaching, though overlapping with instruction, implies a more human-centred process – it is focused on transferring knowledge, while also emphasizing comprehension, memory, and practical application. Teaching is particularly embedded in content delivery (subject knowledge), and thus more pedagogically reasoned than the more neutral ‘instruction.’ This distinction reflects different functions and perspectives: instruction is often institutional and systemic; teaching is interactive and learner-focused; education encapsulates both and adds developmental, social, and philosophical dimensions. Simultaneously, teaching can be compared with training. *Training* is oriented toward *practical proficiency*, usually in a specific skill, task, or profession. It is action-based, often repetitive, and outcome-driven, and is commonly linked to vocational or physical development. In contrast, teaching includes the transfer of abstract knowledge and critical thinking, not just procedural skills.

A similar comparison can be made between other terms, such as schooling and education, and learning and studying. Schooling is defined by its context: it occurs in institutions and is tied to a particular period in one's life. It is a delivery method, not the full content. Schooling can be understood as a subset of education, constrained to time, location, and formal curricula. Thus, while education is lifelong and multi-contextual, schooling is temporal and institutional. However, schooling is the primary entry point to structured education. Learning is the psychological and cognitive process underlying all educational experiences. It can be defined as the internalization of knowledge or skills, whether through formal or informal means. Conversely, studying can be considered a deliberate, purposeful endeavour to acquire knowledge, typically through reading, observation, or experimentation. The fundamental distinction, therefore, lies between process and action: learning as the outcome or change resulting from education; studying as the active engagement or method that enables learning.

The terms previously mentioned (along with other terms not discussed in the present study) contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the processes through which humans gain and apply knowledge. In casual or bureaucratic discourse, the terms are used interchangeably, which can obfuscate the nuances that distinguish them. In disciplines such as pedagogy, educational policy, and the philosophy of education, these conceptual distinctions are of critical importance, since the precise terminology employed has a significant impact on both theory and practice. The contemporary intricacy of these terms reflects historical shifts in understanding human development, the purpose of education, and the evolving contexts in which learning occurs.

The summarized results for the most frequently employed terms in the educational discourse, in the aspect of formation of values, beliefs, attitudes, models of behaviour, etc., are presented in Table 2.

Term	Scope
Formation	The development of character, values, and attitudes; the formation, development, and refinement of skills, characteristics, qualities, and more. The process of shaping, guiding, and integrating values into a comprehensive system that becomes part of a person's identity and worldview.
Upbringing	Bringing up the younger generations, rearing and training in the early years of a person's life. Frequently used to describe the educational (formational) process within the family.
Nurture	The upbringing, training, or care of a person or animal, especially a child; guidance and instruction. It can also refer to the influence of one's social environment on personality, in contrast to innate traits.
Breeding	To raise someone from childhood while offering guidance and direction regarding behaviour, religion, social status, traditions, and similar aspects. Seldom employed in this sense, the more prevalent interpretation pertains to the process of producing offspring and reproducing.
Cultivation	The actions of care for land, crops, and animals; holistically improving a person's characteristics (mainly cognitive, moral, skillset, manners). It is most frequently used in the context of enculturation, adoption, and the refinement of culturally and socially appropriate norms and values in a person.
Refinement	Development, improvement of one's specifics, features, and characteristics. It is typically employed to denote an enhancement in one's social skills, with the objective of attaining cultural and social sophistication.

The second set of terms focuses on the formational dimensions of human development – emphasising character, values, upbringing, and enculturation, rather than purely cognitive or academic learning. These concepts complement educational discourse by addressing the personal, moral, cultural, and emotional aspects of development, which are frequently implicit in more formal understandings of education. All terms under consideration pertain to non-academic aspects of development, encompassing attitudes, values, social behaviour, and identity. These phenomena are indicative of long-term, multifaceted processes that are often associated with social environments, personal experiences, and formal curricula.

Formation is the broadest and most inclusive term in this group, encompassing the development of character, values, and attitudes, as well as the refinement of skills and qualities. It is holistic and long-term, intersecting with both internal (emotional, moral) and external (social, behavioural) domains of human development. The concepts of upbringing and nurture are closely related, as both pertain to the early, foundational processes of human development. While upbringing emphasises early familial influence, especially in childhood, nurture extends this to include broader social and environmental influences, particularly in contrast to biological determinism (nature). The term breeding was historically used in a manner similar to upbringing; however, in contemporary discourse, it signifies biological reproduction. Nevertheless, in its more metaphorical sense, it encompasses moral and behavioural conditioning, particularly concerning social expectations and class. The term reflects historical norms of formation, understood as the cultivation of manners, etiquette, and religious or class-based values. Originally associated with agricultural practices, the term cultivation has been extended to denote the deliberate and purposeful development of individuals, particularly in moral, intellectual, and cultural domains. This phenomenon is frequently associated with enculturation and the gradual adoption of social and cultural norms. Analytically, this term conveys both agency and intentionality, reflecting an active process of shaping identity and values, often in alignment with ideals of social refinement or virtue. On the one hand, refinement serves to narrow the scope to social and cultural sophistication, focusing on subtle improvements in behaviour, manners, or aesthetic sensibilities. Conversely, it can be applied to a range of qualities, skills, and characteristics, indicating their improvement over time. Refinement is regarded as the final stage of formative development, in which raw traits are modified in accordance with social expectations.

From an analytical perspective, this set of terms provides a complementary vocabulary to that of education, instruction, and training. The initially introduced set accentuates knowledge and skills, while the latter places greater emphasis on identity, morality, and socialisation. The integration of these perspectives elucidates the diverse nature of human development as a cognitive and moral-cultural endeavour. This process comprises systematic instruction and knowledge acquisition, experiential learning, familial influences, and engagement with culture. Understanding these nuanced terms enables educators, policymakers, and theorists to devise more holistic educational models that acknowledge the formative dimension of education, which extends beyond the transmission of facts or vocational skills.

Is there a suitable word or phrase in the English language that can be used to denote the concept of formation?

As demonstrated by the results, there are numerous words in the English language used to describe the process of formation. A thorough examination of the fundamental terms indicates a substantial association between early human practices connected to agriculture and animal husbandry, and the evolving conceptualisation of child development. The terms cultivation, nurture, breeding, and refinement initially denoted processes concerned with the care, preparation, and improvement of natural resources – soil, plants, and animals – essential

for survival. For instance, the term cultivation, derived from both Latin and French, primarily referred to the careful preparation of land for agricultural purposes, symbolising deliberate, long-term investment in future growth. Similarly, the term nurture, derived from Old French, originally signified the practice of breeding and feeding cattle. This highlights the environmental factors deemed paramount to the development process. These terms underscore the significance of sustenance and the labour involved in its production, thereby situating care as a fundamental aspect of survival. The transition of such terms into the educational domain illustrates how the logic of tending to living systems for food and continuity was metaphorically extended to encompass human moral, social, and intellectual formation.

The semantic shift is indicative of a profound cultural transformation in which the care once devoted to agricultural and biological processes was redirected toward the human domain, particularly the formation of children. As societies increasingly recognized the child as a bearer of future social and cultural continuity, the language of food production, rooted in necessity and survival, was repurposed to also describe the processes of upbringing and formation. The significance of food, as a vital and foundational aspect of life, is analogous to the importance of forming individuals capable of sustaining and enriching communal life. Terms such as upbringing and cultivation came to describe not only physical growth but also the intentional shaping of moral character, values, and social behaviour. Thus, the evolution of this vocabulary reveals how the ethics of care embedded in food production were transposed onto the realm of child development, suggesting that early conceptions of education were inseparable from the fundamental human concern with survival, continuity, and the transmission of culture.

In contemporary pedagogical discourse, these historically rooted terms retain their metaphorical richness and have been integrated into the scientific literature to differentiate between the processes of teaching and learning and the process of formation (i.e., the shaping of identity, dispositions, and ethical orientations). Based on data retrieved from Google Scholar⁸ for the period 1850–2025, the term formation appears in approximately 255 000 publications. The other related terms show varying frequencies: upbringing appears in 157 000 publications, breeding in 32 700, cultivating and nurturing in 17 900, and refinement in 17 900 as well. The remaining related terms exhibit variable frequencies: upbringing appears in 157 000 publications, breeding in 32 700, cultivating and nurturing in 17 900, and refinement in 17 900. However, it is important to note that not all of these publications employ the terms in the specific ways outlined in this study. Consequently, the results may reflect broader or differing usages and should be interpreted with caution. Nevertheless, the data lead to a key conclusion regarding the use of the most frequently mentioned words in educational contexts, particularly in the formation of values, attitudes, and related phenomena. The predominant term is formation, followed by upbringing and, somewhat surprisingly, breeding (rather than cultivation or refinement).

Although formation is a very logical choice of a word to describe the formational aspect of education, it does not convey the full meaning of the process (nor do any of the other listed terms). The underlying rationale pertains to the notion that the process of formation is understood as a long-term, transformative process that fosters the development of individuals' moral, social, aesthetic, intercultural, civic, and other competencies, encompassing a multitude of interconnected phenomena: development, upbringing, nurturing, the cultivation of skills, the formation of values, the refinement of character, among other aspects. It is therefore posited that another term should be coined (or derived from existing ones, being a combination of some of them) to incorporate all of the aforementioned concepts, thus providing a comprehensive, precise, and exhaustive description of the formational process.

⁸ <https://scholar.google.com/>

It is imperative to recognise that the pursuit of substantial, high-quality, valuable, and relevant research in the domain of education is contingent upon the establishment of consensus and standardization regarding the conceptual apparatus underpinning scholarly inquiry. The lack of terminological clarity and definitional consistency often results in a fragmented understanding of the subject, misaligned methodologies, and limited comparability across studies. In educational research, where concepts such as learning, teaching, development, and formation are central yet variably defined, the absence of a shared conceptual framework can significantly compromise the coherence and cumulative potential of theoretical and empirical findings. Moreover, the conceptual apparatus functions not solely as a linguistic tool but also as a theoretical lens through which educational phenomena are deciphered and analysed. It influences the framing of research questions, the selection of variables, the design of instruments, and the interpretation of results. Inconsistent application or ambiguous definition of key terms compromises the validity and generalisability of educational research, impeding both theoretical advancement and practical implementation. In this context, standardisation should not be perceived as rigid uniformity. Rather, it is more appropriate to consider it as a disciplined negotiation of meaning within scholarly communities. This approach allows for conceptual clarity while accommodating theoretical diversity. Therefore, the development and maintenance of a shared, well-articulated conceptual framework are foundational to producing robust, transferable, and policy-relevant research in education.

Hence, based on the results of the study and the subsequent conclusions, we propose the following terms; 1) a made up in English proposal, namely ‘alumnation’, a direct word derivation from the Latin verb *alo* that the most corresponds to the fundamental idea and essential meaning of *vazpitanie*; 2) other suitable prepositions that already exist in English and are the closest to the Bulgarian terms and mind-set are: ‘cultivation’ or ‘formation’ that can be used or be integrated into the educational vocabulary with the meaning of *vazpitanie*. Cultivation is proposed because it encompasses several of the very important components of the process of *vazpitanie*: the formation of attitudes, values, moral compass, perspectives, and more, the refinement of the personality, the development in personal, social, and other aspects, the construction of beliefs, norms, models of behavior. Additionally, cultivation is related, since the first usage of the word, with nurturing, ‘cultivating’, developing in a holistic way of the object of the process – first concerning mainly natural resources, and later, the development of the child as well. Formation is proposed, as it is, as discussed above, the broadest and most inclusive term, used to denote the process of education in this sense. Formation also depicts one the most important elements of *vazpitanie*, namely – the formation of values, character, attitudes, norms, behavior, skills, competencies, abilities, beliefs, etc. The terms ‘cultivation’ and ‘formation’ are both an adequate choice and their usage in pedagogical studies and literature could serve to outline the specifics in education, teaching, learning, and *vazpitanie*. Simultaneously, adopting a new (in this context) term could support the alignment and the mutual understanding between scholars regarding the differences, specifics, and nuances in the aforementioned processes. Therefore, ‘alumnation’ could be used to describe the whole process of *vazpitanie*, including the aspects of formation, cultivation, refinement, nurturing, and development.

Conclusion

Education and pedagogical science are not exclusively concerned with the process of teaching and learning; they also emphasise the process of formation. It can be theorised that ‘pedagogy is not a mere matter of teaching technique; it is a purposive cultural intervention in individual human development which is deeply saturated with the values and history of the society and community in which it is located’ (Alexander 2008: 92). The formative process is

of equal importance to the holistic development of the individual as the process of teaching and learning. It is therefore imperative that a specific term be assigned to it, one that captures its complex, diverse, nuanced, and broad-spectrum nature and allows it to be systematically studied, discussed, and applied within both theoretical and practical educational contexts. The term proposed in this study (alumnation) is not intended to be the optimal solution for this purpose; rather, it aims to stimulate discussion and to serve as a foundation for collaborative efforts to identify the appropriate answer.

Limitations and applications

The main limitation of this study is the predominant reliance on the Oxford English Dictionary as the primary reference for the etymological and definitional analysis of key formational terms. While the OED is a highly authoritative and comprehensive source, consulting additional lexicographical resources could have yielded a broader range of definitions, historical usages, and semantic nuances, thereby allowing for more extensive comparisons and potentially deeper conclusions.

The theoretical applications of the study relate to the proposed term, which integrates all those used to date to describe the formation process. This word could facilitate research in education, contributing to the unification of the conceptual apparatus and, accordingly, to greater clarity, comparability, and theoretical consistency in scientific developments. The proposition of a single term (alumnation) that combines the meanings of existing concepts creates an opportunity for a more comprehensive and systematic approach to the analysis of the formational process. Furthermore, such a theoretical framework would facilitate dialogue between different scientific schools and educational traditions by offering a shared language for researching and interpreting the phenomenon of formation. The practical applications concern the possibilities for using the proposed term in educational discourse, thereby providing space for a more in-depth dialogue focused specifically on the process of formation. The existence of such a term would also encourage researchers, teachers, and policymakers in education to pay closer attention to processes that occur outside the strictly academic domain but have a profound and lasting impact on individual development.

REFERENCES

- Андреев 1996: *Андреев, Марин*. Дидактика. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“ (Andreev 1996: *Andreev, Marin*. Didaktika. Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“).
- БЕР 1971, 1999: Български етимологичен речник. Т. I (А-З), Т. V (П-С), София: Изд. на БАН (BER 1971, 1999: *Balgarski etimologichen rechnik*. Т. I (A-Z), Т. V (P-S), Sofia: Izd. na BAN).
- БТР 1992: Българско-турски речник. София: Изд. на БАН (BTR 1992: *Balgarsko-turski rechnik*. Sofia: Izd. na BAN).
- Витанова 2015: *Витанова, Наталия*. Антични мислители за образованието. Шумен: Университетско издателство „Епископ Константин Преславски“ (Vitanova 2015: *Vitanova, Natalia*. Antichni mislители za obrazovaniето. Shumen: Universitetsko izdatelstvo “Episkop Konstantin Preslavski”).
- Войнов, Милев 1990: *Войнов, Михаил, Александър Милев*. Латинско-български речник. Четвърто стереотипно издание. София: Наука и изкуство (Voynov, Milev 1990: *Voynov, Mihail, Aleksandar Milev*. Latinsko-balgarski rechnik. Chetvarto stereotipno izdanie. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo).

- Господинов 2018: *Господинов, Бончо*. Научен статут на педагогиката. -В: Педагогика. (Чавдарова-Костова, С., Делибалтова, В., Господинов, Б.), София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 7–27 (Gospodinov 2018: *Gospodinov, Boncho*. Nauchen statut na pedagogikata. -V: Pedagogika. (Chavdarova-Kostova, S., Delibaltova, V., Gospodinov, B.), Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 7–27).
- Гръцки извори за българската история 1968: Гръцки извори за българската история. Том 7, София: БАН (Gratski izvori za balgarskata istoriya 1968: Gratski izvori za balgarskata istoriya Tom 7, Sofia: BAN).
- Гюзелев 1985: *Гюзелев, Васил*. Училища, скриптории, библиотеки и знания в България, XIII-XIV век. София: Народна просвета (Gyuzelev 1985: *Gjuzelev, Vasil*. Uchilishta, skriptorii, biblioteki i znanja v Balgaria, XIII-XIV vek. Sofia: Narodna prosveta).
- Делибалтова 2018: *Делибалтова, Вася*. Обучение и процес на обучение – съвременни интерпретации. -В: Педагогика. (Чавдарова-Костова, С., Делибалтова, В., Господинов, Б.), София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 269–275 (Delibaltova 2018: *Delibaltova, Vasya*. Obuchenie i protses na obuchenie – savremenni interpretatsii. -V: Pedagogika. (Chavdarova-Kostova, S., Delibaltova, V., Gospodinov, B.) Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 269–275).
- Димитров 2016: *Димитров, Любен*. Научен статут на теорията на възпитанието. -В: Илиев 2017: *Илиев, Иван Иванов*. Тълкуванието на Книга на пророк Даниил от Иполит Римски в старобългарски превод. София: БАН (Iliev 2017: *Iliev, Ivan Ivanov*. Talkuvaniето na Kniga na prorok Daniil ot Ipolit Rimski v starobalgarski prevod. Sofia: BAN).
- История на българската средновековна литература 2008: История на българската средновековна литература. София: Изток-Запад (Istoriya na balgarskata srednovekovna literatura 2008: Istoriya na balgarskata srednovekovna literatura. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad).
- Кирило-методиевска енциклопедия 1985, 1995, 2003: Кирило-методиевска енциклопедия. I, II, III, IV. София: Академично издателство „Марин Дринов“ (Kirilo-Methodievska entsiklopediya: Kirilo-Methodievska entsiklopediya. I. 1985; II. 1995; III, IV. 2003, Sofia: Akademichno izdatelstvo “Marin Drinov”).
- Литаврин 1984: *Литаврин, Геннадий Григориевич*. Как са живеели византийците. София: Наука и изкуство (Litavrin 1984: *Litavrin, Genadiy Grigorievich*. Kak sa zhiveeli vizantiytsite. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo).
- Милтенов 2024: *Милтенов, Явор*. Преславските лексикални маркери. София: Авалон (Miltenov 2024: *Miltenov, Yavor*. Preslavskite leksikalni markeri. Sofia: Avalon).
- МОН 2015: Закон за предучилищното и училищното образование. Обн. ДВ. бр. 79 от 13 октомври 2015 г. последни изм. и доп. ДВ. бр. 64 от 5 Август 2025 г. (MON 2015: Zakon za preduchilishtnoto i uchilishtnoto obrazovanie. Obn. DV. br. 79 ot 13 Oktomvri 2015 g. posledni izm. i dop. DV. br. 64 ot 5 Avgust 2025 g.). Николова 2013: *Николова, Дияна*. Античната пайдейя и съвременната образователна ситуация. Opera Slavica, XXIII, 4, Brno: Ústav slavistiky Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy univerzity, 285–294 (Nikolova 2013: *Nikolova, Diyana*. Antichnata paideiya i savremen-nata obrazovatelna situatsiya. Opera Slavica, XXIII, 4, Brno: Ústav slavistiky Filozofické fakulty Masarykovy university, 285–294 <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/129035>).
- Охридски 1970: *Климент Охридски*. Събрани съчинения. Том първи. Обработили Б. Ст. Ангелов, К. М. Куев, Хр. Кодов. София: БАН (Ohridski 1970: *Kliment Ohridski*. Sabrani sachineniya. Tom parvi. Obrabotili B. St. Angelov, K. M. Kuev, Hr. Kodov. Sofia: BAN).

- Петров 1992: *Петров, Петър*. Дидактика. София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“ (Petrov 1992: *Petrov, Petar*. Didaktika. Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“).
- Радев, Легкоступ, Александрова 2011: *Радев, Пламен, Пламен Легкоступ, Албена Александрова*. Основи на училищната педагогика. Велико Търново: Фабер (Radev, Legkostup, Aleksandrova 2011: *Radev, Plamen, Plamen Legkostup, Albena Aleksandrova*. Osnovi na uchilishtnata pedagogika. Veliko Tarnovo: Faber).
- СБЛ 1992: Стара българска литература. Том пети. Естествознание. Съст. и ред. Анисава Милтенова. София: Български писател (SBL 1992: Stara balgarska literatura. Tom peti. Estestvoznanie. Sast. i red. Anisava Miltenova. Sofia: Balgarski pisatel).
- СК 2008: Спасителна книга. Превод от старогръцки Янева, Петя, Сергей Иванов. София: Колекция АРХЕТИП (2008: Spasitelna kniga. Prevod ot starogratski Yaneva, Petya, Sergey Ivanov. Sofia: Kolektsiya ARHETIP).
- ССб 1993: Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Т. 2. Речник-индекс. София: Изд. на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“ (SSb 1993: Simeonov sbornik (po Svetoslavoviya prepis ot 1073 g.). T. 2. Rechnik-indeks. Sofia: Izd. na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov“).
- ССб 2015: Симеонов сборник (по Светославовия препис от 1073 г.). Т. 3. Гръцки извори. София: Изд. на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“ (SSb 2015: Simeonov sbornik (po Svetoslavoviya prepis ot 1073 g.). T. 3. Gratski izvori. Sofia: Izd. na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov“).
- СтР 1999, 2009: Старобългарски речник. Т. 1. А–Н; Т. 2. О–У. Отг. ред.: чл.-кор. проф. Д. Иванова-Мирчева; Ред. колегия: проф. А. Давидов, Д. Иванова-Мирчева, Ж. Икономова. София: Изд. ЕТ „Валентин Траянов“ (StR 1999, 2009: Starobalgarski rechnik. T.1. A–N; T. 2. O–U. Otg. red.: chl. -kor. prof. D. Ivanova-Mircheva; Red. kolegiya: prof. A. Davidov, D. Ivanova-Mircheva, Zh. Ikonomova. Sofia: Izd. ET “Valentin Trajanov“).
- Тасева, Котова, Петров, Дикова, Станковска, Митов 2024: *Тасева, Лора, Добриела Котова, Иван Петров, Екатерина Дикова, Петра Станковска, Георги Митов*. Учителното евангелие на Константин Преславски. Т. 1. Старобългарски-гръцки речник. София: Изд. на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“ (Taseva, Kotova, Petrov, Dikova, Stankovska, Mitov 2024: *Taseva, Lora, Dobriela Kotova, Ivan Petrov, Ekaterina Dikova, Petra Stankovska, Georgi Mitov*. Uchitelното evangelie na Konstantin Preslavski. T. 1. Starobalgarski-gratski rechnik. Sofia: Izd. na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov“).
- Тасева, Котова, Петров, Дикова, Станковска, Митов 2024: *Тасева, Лора, Добриела Котова, Иван Петров, Екатерина Дикова, Петра Станковска, Георги Митов*. Учителното евангелие на Константин Преславски. Т. 2. Гръцко-старобългарски речник. София: Изд. на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов“ (Taseva, Kotova, Petrov, Dikova, Stankovska, Mitov 2024: *Taseva, Lora, Dobriela Kotova, Ivan Petrov, Ekaterina Dikova, Petra Stankovska, Georgi Mitov*. Uchitelното evangelie na Konstantin Preslavski. T. 2. Gratsko-starobalgarski rechnik. Sofia: Izd. na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov“).
- Теория на възпитанието. (Димитров, Л. и кол.), София: Вѐда Словѐна-ЖГ, 15–38 (Dimitrov 2016: *Dimitrov, Lyuben*. Nauchen statut na teoriyata na vazpitanieto. -V: Teoria na vazpitanieto (Dimitrov, L. i kol.), Sofia: Veda Slovena-ZhG, 15–38).
- Христов 2023: *Христов, Александър*. Институционализиране на грижата за бедните и нуждаещите се от християнската църква на прехода от Античност към Средновековие (I–IX в.). -В: ГСУ. Факултет по педагогика. (116) София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 35–93 (Hristov 2023: *Hristov, Aleksandar*. Institutsionalizirane

- na grizhata za bednite i nuzhdaeshnite se ot hristiyanskata tsarkva na prehoda ot Antichnost kam Srednovekovie (I–IX v.). -V: GSU. Fakultet po pedagogika. (116) Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 35–93).
- Чавдарова-Костова 2016: *Чавдарова-Костова, Сийка*. За същността и смисъла на възпитанието. – Във: Възпитанието. Съдържателни и процесуални измерения. (Чавдарова-Костова, С., съст.), София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 9–23 (Chavdarova-Kostova 2016: *Chavdarova-Kostova, Sijka*. Za sashtnostta i smisala na vazpitanieto. – V: Vazpitanieto. Sadarzhatelni i protsesualni izmereniya. (Chavdarova-Kostova, S., sast.), Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 9–23).
- Чавдарова-Костова 2018: *Чавдарова-Костова, Сийка*. Възпитанието като процес. – В: Педагогика. (Чавдарова-Костова, С., Делибалтова, В., Господинов, Б.), София: УИ „Св. Климент Охридски“, 137–151 (Chavdarova-Kostova 2018: *Chavdarova-Kostova, Sijka*. Vazpitanieto kato protses. V: Pedagogika. (Chavdarova-Kostova, S., Delibaltova, V., Gospodinov, B.), Sofia: UI „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“, 137–151).
- Даничић 1863: *Даничић, Бура*. Рјечник из књижевних старина српских. Дио први. А–К. Биоград: Државна штампарија (Danichić 1863: *Danichić, Đura*. Rječnik iz književnih starina srpskih. Dio prvi. А–К. Biograd: Drzhavna shtamparija).
- Дворецкий 1976: *Дворецкий, Иосиф Хананович*. Латинско-русский словарь. Москва (Dvoretzkiy 1976: *Dvoretzkiy, Yosif Hananovich*. Latinsko-ruskiy slovar. Moskva).
- Невоструев 1868: *Невоструев, Капитон Иванович*. Слово святого Ипполита об антихристе в славянском переводе по списку XII века. Москва: Синодальная типография (Nevostruev 1868: *Nevostruev, Kapiton Ivanovich*. Slovo svyatogo Ippolita ob antihriste v slavyanskom perevode po spisku XII veka. Moskva: Sonadal'naya tipografiya).
- Рибарова 2014: *Рибарова, Зденка*. Григоровичев паримејник. II. Лексика. Index verborum. Скопје: МАНУ (Ribarova 2014: *Ribarova, Zdenka*. Grigorovichev parimeynik. II. Leksika. Index verborum. Skorje: MANU).
- Рибарова, Хауптова 1998: *Рибарова, Зденка, Зое Хауптова*. Григоровичев паримејник. I. Текст со критички апарат. Скопје: МАНУ (Ribarova, Hauptova 1998: *Ribarova, Zdenka, Zoe Hauptova*. Grigorovichev parimeynik. I. Tekst so kritichki aparat. Skorje: MANU).
- SJS 1958–1997: Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae. Hlav. red. J. Kurz, Z. Hauptová. Praha: Nakladatelství Československé Akademie věd.
- Словарь 1847: Словарь церковно-славянского и русского языка. Т. I–IV. Санкт-Петербург: Императорская академия наук (Slovar 1847: Slovar' tserkovno-slavyanskogo i russkogo yazyka. T. I–IV. Sankt-Peterburg: Imperatorskaya akademiya nauk).
- Фасмер 1987: *Фасмер, Макс*. Этимологический словарь русского языка. В четырех томах. Перевод с немецкого и дополнения члена-корреспондента АН СССР О.Н. Трубачева. Москва: Прогресс (Fasmer 1987: *Fasmer, Maks*. Etimologicheskiy slovar' russkogo yazyka. V chetyreh tomah. Perevod s nemetskogo i dopolneniya chlenakorrespondenta AN SSSR O.N. Trubacheva. Moskva: Progress).
- Цейтлин, Вечерка, Благова 1994: *Цейтлин, Рая М., Радослав Вечерка, Э. Благова*. Старославянский словарь (по рукописям X–XI веков). Москва: Русский язык (Tseytlin, Vecherka, Blagova 1994: *Tseytlin, Raya M., Radoslav Vecherka, E. Blagova*. Staroslavjanskiy slovar' (po rukopisyam X–XI vekov). Moskva: Russkiy yazyk).

- Didi 2012: *Didi, Christiano*. Uchenie vs chytrost'. Per uno statuto della retorica in area slavoeclesiastica medievale. Ricerche slavistiche, Roma: La Sapienza, 10 (56), 159–201).
- Doharey et al. 2023: *Doharey, R. K., Verma, Aman, Verma, Kapil, Raj Yadav Vishal*. Education: Meaning, definition & Types. -In: Agriculture Extension Education, Chapter 1. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372418302_Education_Meaning_definition_Types. Retrieved February 16, 2026.
- Dynda, Stankovska 2024: *Dynda, Jiří, Petra Stankovska*. The Extent of the Early Old Church Slavonic Translation of the Pentateuch Preserved in Croatian Glagolitic Breviaries and Missals: The Book of Genesis in the Breviaries. Zagreb: SLOVO, 74, 45–63.
- Le Guillou 1984: *Le Guillou, Jean-Yves*. Grammaire du Vieux Bulgare (Vieux Slave). Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Liddell, Scott 1940: *Liddell, K.G., R. Scott. A. Greek-English Lexicon*. Revied ed. by H. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie. Oxford: Calderon Press. E-version in Perseus Digital Library Project. Ed. by G.R. Crane. Tufts University. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/search?redirect=true>
- Miklosich 1845: *Miklosich, Franz*. Radices linguae Slovenicae veteris dialecti. Lipsiae: Libraria Weidmannia.
- Miklosich 1862: *Miklosich, Franz*. Lexicon palaeo-slovenico-graeco-latinum emendatum auctum. Vindobonae: Guilelmus Braumueller.
- Moreira 2025: *Moreira, Alexandre*. Etymology and general conceptions of education. Excerpt from the PhD thesis 'The general theory of curricular rights'. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.29559.74401
- Murphy 2008: *Murphy, Patricia*. Defining Pedagogy. -In: K. Hall, P. Murphy and J. Soler (Eds.), Pedagogy and Practice: Culture and Identities, UK: The Open University and SAGE, 28–39.
- ODB 1991: Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium. Ed. Alexander Kazhdan. T.1., New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- O Wright 2022: *O Wright, Robert*. Nature versus nurture – on the origins of a specious argument: *Exposome*, Volume 2, Issue 1 <https://academic.oup.com/exposome/article/2/1/osac005/6653302>
- Richard 2000: *Bonwetsch, Georg Nathaniel, Marcel Richard*. Hippolyt werke. Erster band. Erster teil. Kommentar zu Daniel. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Robin 2008: *Alexander, Robin*. Essays on pedagogy. London: Routledge.
- Shah 2021: *Shah, Kumar*. Conceptualizing and Defining Pedagogy. IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME), e-ISSN: 2320–7388, p- ISSN: 2320-737x, Volume 11, Issue 1, Ser. II, 2021 (Jan.–Feb. 2021), PP 06-29 www.iosrjournals.org
- Schmidt 2017: *Schmidt, Thomas, C*. Hippolytus of Rome: Commentary on Daniel and 'Chronicon'. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- Theissen 1991: *Theissen, Ulrich*. Deutsch-altbulgarisches, Wörterbuch. Немско старобългарски речник. Т. 1. А–К, Т. 2. L–Z, Wien: Institut Slawistik.
- Young 2011: *Young, Norman*. Pedagogy: A Lexical Oddity. Teach: Avondale University, vol. 5, no. 2, 22–25.

Online sources:

King James Bible – <https://www.kingjamesbibleonline.org/>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 1. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/5157687392>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 2.a. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6150367370>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 3. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6895584988>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 4.a. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9508176698>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 4.b. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/8882928319>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Education, n., 4.c. In Oxford English dictionary. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/9432912465>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Breeding. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=breeding>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Cultivation. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=cultivation>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Formation. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=formation>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Instruction. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=instruction>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Learning. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=learning>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Nurturing. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=nurturing>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Pedagogy, n., 1. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/7275309379>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Pedagogy, n., 2. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/5342660908>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Pedagogy, n., 3. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved July 28, 2025, from <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/1029842480>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Refinement. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=refinement>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Schooling. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=schooling>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Schooling. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=schooling>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Studying. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=studying>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Teaching. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from https://www.oed.com/dictionary/teach_v?tab=factsheet#19063354

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Training. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=training>

Oxford University Press. (n.d.). Upbringing. In *Oxford English dictionary*. Retrieved February 16, 2026, from <https://www.oed.com/search/dictionary/?scope=Entries&q=upbringing>