RECYCLING OUR WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL TERMINOLOGY IN ROMANIAN. UPDATES TO A SPECIALISED GLOSSARY

CRISTINA VARGA

Facultatea de Litere, Babeș-Bolyai University

cristina.varga@ubbcluj.ro

ANDREEA-VICTORIA GRIGORE

Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest

victoria.grigore@unibuc.ro

Keywords: *Romanian terminology, glossary, waste recycling, environmental terminology, emerging terminology*.

Cuvinte-cheie: *terminologie românească, glosar, reciclarea deșeurilor, terminologia mediului, terminologie emergentă.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Climate change is one of the most pressing issues of modern times. It has come to the fore in political discourse, within governmental organisations (*the Commission for the Environment, Climate Change and Energy – ENVE*, etc.), non-governmental organisations (*Greenpeace*, *Climate Chance*, Réseau *Action Climat*, etc.), as well as in the press and on social media. However, this discourse appears to be gradually intensifying, with recurring references to *extreme heatwaves*, *severe droughts*, *floods*, *storms*, and *widespread wildfires*.

The issue is also addressed from a scientific perspective, both in international research (Peya 2022; Howell 2023; Klöck *et al.* 2020; Madhanagopal *et al.* 2022) and in Romanian research (Căpățînă & Simonescu 2006; Oroian *et al.* 2009; Aciu *et al.* 2014; Bâca & Cioanca 2016), with the linguistic inventory being systematised and documented in glossaries such as: Maunder (1992), OFEV (2020), *Termium* (2023), and *FranceTerme* (2025).

Taking the *Communicative Theory of Terminology* (Cabré 1993) as its theoretical framework, this article pursues the following objectives of research: a) the analysis of the set of terms relating to *waste recycling* in the field of *Environmental and Climate*

SCL, LXXVII, 2026, nr. 2, București, p. 277–287

DOI: 10.59277/SCL.2026.2.11

Negotiations in the Romanian language, b) the examination of their morphosyntactic structure, and c) the observation of terminological variation, an indicator of a terminology in the process of being consolidated. This terminology comes to enrich an already existing glossary, created on the occasion of the *30th Conference of the Parties on Climate Change* (*COP30*) and published by the Commission for the Enrichment of the French Language (https://www.culture.fr/franceterme/Nos-publications). It currently comprises 300 terms of *Environmental and Climate Negotiations*, in French, English, Arabic, Brazilian Portuguese, and Colombian and Mexican Spanish, and will soon be enhanced with terminological equivalents in several languages, including Romanian. As part of this on-going multilingual enrichment, the two authors of the present study have contributed Romanian equivalents for terms relating to waste recycling and to endangered biodiversity and ecosystems.

This article is aimed at researchers, scholars, professional translators and students with an interest in emerging terminology, terminological neologisms and terminography in the field of climate change.

2. *ENVIRONMENTAL AND CLIMATE NEGOTIATIONS*. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The pace of development in this field over recent decades has been shaped by political events such as the *Conference of the Parties* (*COP*), which has been held annually since 1995, leading to the adoption of legislative decisions, such as all COP decisions over the last three decades (https://www.unccd.int/convention/cop-decisions), whilst also contributing to the adoption of EU legislation (*Green Deal*, *European Climate Law*) or domestic legislation (*SNASC 2023-2030, PNASC 2023-2030*). Together, these documents demonstrate the richness and variety of a specialised, multilingual, officially regulated and neological language.

Scientific research in this field highlights patterns of cooperation in climate change negotiations, the evolution of coalitions over time, and the political groups that have emerged recently (Klöck *et al.* 2020). Other studies focus on the fight against climate change and its financial impact on communities, in the context of a climate ultimatum (Peya 2022). Legal perspective on the field is addressed by Madhanagopal *et al.* (2022), which examine theoretical, empirical and practical aspects of climate justice challenges. From a historical perspective, Howell (2023) considers the issue of *waste management* as a key driver of climate change, explaining its limitations within a specific historical context.

In Romania, the issue of climate change is addressed within a limited number of scientific publications (Căpățînă & Simonescu 2006; Oroian *et al.* 2009; Aciu *et al.* 2014, Bâca & Cioanca 2016), given that this is a field which falls primarily within the remit of environmental policies and government authorities.

As regards terminological research, the glossary developed by the project team of which we are part continues a rich tradition in the field, with numerous glossaries having been published over several decades. One such glossary is the *Dictionary of Global Climate Change* (Maunder 1992), a monolingual glossary in English presenting terms and their definitions. This was followed by the *Glossary of Climate Change Terms* (2016), published by the United States Environmental Protection Agency and adopting an identical format. In 2020, the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (OFEV) published *Glossaire sur le climat. Notions de base pour la formation professionnelle*, a monolingual glossary in French, which presents not only basic concepts, but also related concepts, references and supplementary sources for each term. In 2023, several multilingual glossaries covering between 3 and 11 languages were published online: *Dictionnaire du climat* (Réseau *Action Climat*)[1], *Le dictionnaire du climat : un guide pratique sur le changement climatique* (United Nations)[2], and *Lexique sur les changements climatiques et la santé publique* (*Termium*)[3]. Furthermore, in 2025, *FranceTerme* published the glossary *300 termes clés pour les négociations environnementales et climatiques*[4], an updated edition of which, featuring Romanian equivalents, is currently in progress.

Environmental and Climate Negotiations is therefore a vast field, studied from multiple perspectives, with a wealth of specialist literature.

3. METHODOLOGY OF RESEARCH

Considering that the aim of our research is to provide an update to an existing glossary, the methodology adopted for this study took as its starting point the list of terms established by *FranceTerme*, the coordinator of terminological research, based on a conceptual hierarchic model comprising 8 thematic categories: 1) *Sauver notre planète* (89 terms), 2) *Recycler nos déchets* (17), 3) *Biodiversité et écosystèmes en danger* (41), 4) *Carbone et gaz à effet de serre* (21), 5) *Énergies fossiles et bioénergie* (21), 6) *Aménager la ville* (26), 7) *Mobilité durable* (35), 8) *Diplomatie climatique et environnementale* (30).

The authors of this study have addressed only 2 of the thematic categories within this project, *Recycling our Waste* and *Endangered Biodiversity and Ecosystems*, with the present study focusing specifically on the former category. Thus, in an initial phase of the work, the 17 terms have been identified in

[1] *Dictionnaire du climat* (https://dico.unric.org/fr/).

[2] *Le dictionnaire du climat : un guide pratique sur le changement climatique* (https://www.un.org/climatesecuritymechanism/en/climate-dictionary).

[3] *Lexique sur les changements climatiques et la santé publique* (https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/ressources/bibliotheque/dictionnaires/vocabulaire-changements-climatiques.aspx).

[4] *300 termes clés pour les négociations environnementales et climatiques* (https://www.culture.fr/franceterme/Nos-publications).

specialised, authentic texts from reliable sources in Romanian, which formed the corpus used in our research. The degree of specialisation of the texts ranges from highly specialised legal texts to press articles aimed at a general scientific audience. The terms are accompanied by their grammatical category, and any *competing terms* in Romanian identified in the consulted texts have also been included.

During the next stage, an analysis of the morphosyntactic structure of the terms has been carried out, identifying two main categories: *monolexical* and *plurilexical terms*; for each category, its formation has been examined and illustrated with examples. Following this analysis, attention has also been paid to *terminological variation* within this subject area – a phenomenon specific to emerging specialist languages, in which terms are not yet clearly consolidated within the language, and speakers use several terms to refer to the same concept.

Given the limitations imposed by the length of this article, we believe that our study, despite its relatively small terminological inventory, contributes to a better understanding of the vocabulary of waste recycling, a subject area that is poorly documented in Romanian yet of great interest. Furthermore, we believe it is important to draw attention to the thematic areas targeted by terminological research in Romanian. All the results of this research are outlined in the *Conclusions* section.

4. *RECYCLING OUR WASTE*. TERMINOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

Based on the theoretical framework previously discussed, this section turns to the analysis of a corpus comprising 17 terms and 6 variants from the field of waste recycling. All 23 units are examined according to two complementary analytical criteria, which directly reflect the objectives of the present study: the analysis of their morphosyntactic structure and the investigation of terminological variation as an indicator of terminological neology, the emergence of new terminology and the on-going development of specialised vocabularies.

The Romanian terminological units analysed below are accompanied by their specialised English equivalents, drawn from the terminology inventory established by *FranceTerme*. English forms are reproduced as listed in the source inventory in order to facilitate the comparative analysis of the Romanian designations. Since the majority of the selected terminological units are nouns or noun phrases, their grammatical information is indicated where relevant, using the abbreviations *m.n.* (masculine noun), *f.n.* (feminine noun), and *n.n.* (neuter noun). In only one case is the abbreviation *adj.* used, indicating the corresponding grammatical category.

4.1. THE MORPHOSYNTACTIC STRUCTURE OF THE **RECYCLING OUR WASTE** TERMS

The first subsection of the terminological analysis focuses on the morphosyntactic structure of the selected specialised units, with a view to identifying the main structural patterns involved in their formation and to determining the extent to which Romanian terminology reflects, adapts or diverges from the corresponding patterns attested in French and English. The corpus includes 6 monolexical units, while the remaining terms and variants are plurilexical units, encompassing a wide range of multiword structures.

4.1.1. *Recycling our Waste* monolexical terms

The 6 monolexical terminological units identified in the corpus – *suprareciclare* ("upcycling", f.n.), *biodegradabil* ("biodegradable", adj.), *biodegradabilitate* ("biodegradability", f.n.), *compostaj* ("composting", n.n.), *PET* ("PET", *n.n.*), and *PETE* ("PET", *n.n.*) – illustrate three different mechanisms of lexical enrichment: internal, external, and mixed. To these units, the term *reciclare* ("recycling", f.n.) may be added as the hyperonym designating the entire category of *Recycling our Waste*. Although it is not explicitly included in the corpus elaborated by *FranceTerme*, *reciclare* is central to the terminology under investigation.

The term *reciclare* is an internally formed Romanian designation resulting from derivation by suffixation, namely the addition of the abstract suffix *-are* to the verb *a recicla* ("to recycle"). It subsequently serves as the base for the formation of *suprareciclare*, through the addition of the prefix *supra-* ("up-"). The latter thus illustrates a two-stage derivational process: the internally derived noun *reciclare* is itself used as the base for a further prefixed formation. This process is particularly relevant to the present analysis, as it provides a clear example of the use of internal word-formation mechanisms in the development of specialised terminology.

With regard to external lexical enrichment through borrowing, 4 terminological units are involved. Rom. *biodegradabil* corresponds to Fr. *biodégradable* and Engl. *biodegradable*, while Rom. *biodegradabilitate* is represented in French and English by *biodégradabilité* and *biodegradability*, respectively. Both Romanian terms therefore display a mixed French-English etymological origin, reflecting their status as internationally circulating units. By contrast, Rom. *compostaj* is borrowed from Fr. *compostage*, representing a more straightforward case of lexical borrowing. Moreover, the abbreviation *PET* represents a borrowing, having been adopted into Romanian from the English abbreviation *PET* for *polyethylene terephthalate* (*FranceTerme* 2025: 44). Consequently, these examples demonstrate different forms of external lexical enrichment, ranging from the adaptation of lexical units to the adoption of an abbreviation already established in another language.

Finally, *PETE* illustrates the mixed mechanism of abbreviation, based on the reduction of the Engl. *polyethylene terephthalate* and Fr. *polytéréphtalate d'éthylène*.

Its presence in the Romanian terminological inventory, alongside its significant absence from the corresponding lists of the other Romance languages, provides further evidence of the interaction between external linguistic influence and the mechanisms through which specialised designations are incorporated into Romanian.

4.1.2. *Recycling our Waste* plurilexical terms

Plurilexical terms are representative of syntagmation, which, with 17 out of 23 units identified in the terminological inventory of the *Recycling our Waste* category, emerges as the most productive internal means of lexical enrichment. This productivity is accompanied by a high diversity of patterns of organisation, as the analysis has identified 8 such patterns. 3 are based on internal morphological syntagmation involving genitives, prepositions, and adjectives and may therefore be regarded as primary patterns of organisation. In addition, the other 4 patterns are secondary, as they are essentially derived from the aforementioned primary patterns, while a distinct pattern can also be identified, whose particular characteristics will be also examined.

The most representative primary pattern of organisation is *noun + noun in the genitive*, identified in 4 instances: *inertizare a deșeurilor* ("waste inerting", f.n.), *reciclare a deșeurilor*[1] ("waste recovery", f.n.), *reciclare a deșeurilor*[2] ("waste recycling", f.n.), and *recuperare a deșeurilor* ("waste recovery", f.n.). From a structural point of view, in all 4 terminological units, the genitive noun *deșeurilor* (literally, "of the waste") functions as the dependent of the head noun and specifies the object or reference category to which the process denoted by the head noun applies. The construction thus contributes to the terminological specialisation of the head noun by explicitly relating the process to the domain of waste.

Furthermore, the formal identity of the two occurrences of *reciclare a deșeurilor* is noteworthy, as they refer to the distinct English designations *waste recovery* and *waste recycling*. This case demonstrates that terminological equivalence is not necessarily one-to-one across languages: in Romanian, a single designation refers to distinct concepts that are lexically differentiated in English.

The primary pattern discussed above gives rise to 2 secondary patterns, obtained by extending the basic *noun + noun in the genitive* structure with an additional nominal constituent. The first, *noun + noun in the genitive + noun in the accusative*, occurs in 2 terminological units, namely *reciclare a deșeurilor de plastic* ("chemical recycling", f.n.) and *recuperare a energiei din deșeuri* ("energy recovery from waste", f.n.), while the second, *noun + noun in the genitive 1 + noun in the genitive 2*, is attested in *prevenire a generării deșeurilor* ("waste prevention", f.n.).

In all 3 units, the head noun retains the function identified in the primary pattern, denoting an action or process associated with waste recycling or management. The 2 units following the first secondary pattern extend the basic

genitive construction by means of the prepositions *de* ("of") and *din (*"out of"), which introduce distinct semantic relations: *de plastic* specifies the material involved, whereas *din deșeuri* identifies the source from which the recovered energy is obtained. Nonetheless, in *prevenire a generării deșeurilor*, the second genitive is embedded within the first genitive constituent: *deșeurilor* depends syntactically on *generării*, which in turn depends on the head noun *prevenire*. This latter structure illustrates how the primary pattern can be expanded to accommodate specific conceptual relations within a single terminological unit.

The second representative primary pattern of organisation is *noun + preposition + noun in the accusative*, which accounts for 3 examples: *centru de reciclare* ("waste sorting and recovery centre", n.n.), *taxă de salubrizare* ("pay as you throw", f.n.), and *tereftalat de polietilenă* ("polyethylene terephthalate", m.n.). On the one hand, in the first 2 units, the constituents are lexical items also found in general language, which makes the meaning of the resulting designations relatively transparent to non-specialists. On the other hand, *tereftalat de polietilenă* represents a highly specialised terminological unit, whose interpretation presupposes domain-specific knowledge and which is primarily associated with the field of chemistry, while also being relevant to waste recycling.

From a semantic perspective, although the preposition *de* occurs consistently, it establishes different relations between the constituents: it expresses function and purpose in *centru de reciclare* and *taxă de salubrizare*, respectively, while in *tereftalat de polietilenă* it denotes a relation of composition. Thus, despite their identical morphosyntactic structure, the 3 terminological units encode distinct conceptual relations between their constituents.

This primary pattern is further extended into a secondary pattern, *noun + preposition + noun in the accusative + noun in the genitive*, which is attested in 2 instances: *centru de colectare a deșeurilor* (n.n.) and *punct de colectare a deșeurilor* (n.n.), both designating facilities for the collection of waste. The genitive constituent *deșeurilor* is syntactically dependent on *colectare*, rather than directly on the head noun *centru* or *punct*, and specifies the object of the activity designated by *colectare*. Therefore, the secondary pattern preserves the functional relation of the primary pattern, while adding a level of specification within the terminological unit.

The third primary pattern of organisation, *noun + adjective*, occurs in 3 instances: *deșeu biodegradabil* ("biodegradable waste", n.n.), *reciclare enzimatică* ("enzymatic recycling", f.n.), and *reciclare mecanică* ("mechanical recycling", f.n.). In these units, the head noun denotes a fundamental element of the subdomain, namely *waste* in the first case and *the recycling process* in the other two. The adjectives function attributively, further specifying and restricting the reference of the head noun, and are themselves specialised lexical units. Moreover, *enzimatică* and *mecanică* reflect interdisciplinary links with other fields, particularly chemistry and physics.

The secondary pattern derived from the aforementioned primary *pattern* is *noun + adjective + noun in the genitive*, represented by a single instance: *valorificare energetică a deșeurilor* (“energy recovery from waste”, f.n.). The unit preserves the attributive relation, with the adjective *energetică* specifying the type of process denoted by the head noun *valorificare*. The genitive constituent *a deșeurilor* identifies the object to which this process applies and is syntactically dependent on the head noun rather than on the adjective. As a result, the unit illustrates how an adjectival specification can be complemented by a genitive construction.

The final primary pattern of organisation, *noun 1 + noun 2 + noun in the accusative*, is represented by a single terminological unit, *reciclare deșeuri din construcții* (“deconstruction”, f.n.), and has no corresponding secondary pattern. The head noun *reciclare* denotes the process, while *deșeuri* specifies the object of this process and *din construcții* further restricts its reference by identifying the type of waste concerned. Structurally, the unit is therefore characterised by a hierarchical dependency in which the prepositional phrase *din construcții* modifies *deșeuri*, rather than the head noun *reciclare*.

4.2. TERMINOLOGICAL VARIATION OF THE **RECYCLING OUR WASTE** TERMS

The second subsection of the terminological analysis points out *terminological variation*, identified in 4 instances involving 6 variant forms in the Romanian inventory of *Recycling our Waste*. These cases are examined in the following paragraphs, with particular attention to their relevance for the monitoring of terminological change.

The first case of terminological variation concerns the coexistence of the full designation *tereftalat de polietilenă* (“polyethylene terephthalate”, m.n.) and the abbreviated variants PET (n.n.) and PETE (n.n.). All 3 refer to the same chemical substance, but differ in their degree of formal reduction. Their coexistence in Romanian illustrates the circulation of alternative forms resulting from different processes of terminological adoption and integration. This case is particularly relevant to terminological monitoring, as the simultaneous presence of a full designation and two abbreviations may indicate different stages of terminological standardisation.

The second case involves the pair formed by the term *reciclare a deșeurilor* (f.n.) and its variant *recuperare a deșeurilor* (f.n.), both associated with the English denomination *waste recovery*. Their coexistence is particularly noteworthy because two distinct Romanian lexical choices are used to render a single English denomination. The semantic proximity of *reciclare* and *recuperare* facilitates their use within the same specialised domain, while their coexistence may also reflect differences in the way the process concerned is conceptualised. The presence of both forms points to a situation of denominative variation that may require further monitoring in order to determine whether one variant becomes established as the preferred form or whether both continue to circulate.

A third instance of variation is represented by the unit *recuperare a energiei din deșeuri* ("energy-from-waste", f.n.) and its variant *valorificare energetică a deșeurilor* (f.n.). The 2 designations coexist as alternative Romanian denominations for the same concept, despite their different lexical choices. Their coexistence is significant from the perspective of terminological development, as it may indicate an on-going process of terminological selection and standardisation.

The fourth case focuses on the coexistence of the terminological unit *centru de colectare* ("waste sorting and recovery centre", n.n.) and its 2 variants, *centru de colectare a deșeurilor* (n.n.) *and punct de colectare a deșeurilor* (n.n.). All 3 share the same referential domain, namely locations intended for waste collection, while differing in their formal and lexical composition. The first 2 forms differ in terms of the presence or absence of the specification *a deșeurilor*, whereas the third involves a lexical substitution of *centru* with *punct*. This variation is relevant from a terminological perspective, as it may reflect either genuine denominative competition or a potential conceptual distinction between different types of collection facilities.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The analysis undergone demonstrates that the Romanian terminological inventory belonging to the thematic category *Recycling our Waste* is characterised by a high diversity of morphosyntactic structures. Furthermore, the presence of terminological variation has been registered in some examples, which proves the development of an emerging terminology in the field of *Environmental and Climatic Negotiations*.

From a morphosyntactic perspective, the research has identified two major terminological categories, namely *monolexical* and *plurilexical* units, the latter being more significant, with 17 out of the total number of 23 waste recycling terms. Taking into account the criterion of the internal structure, the terminology analysed in Romanian emphasises *noun + noun in the genitive* (*inertizare a deșeurilor*) as a predominant structure, closely followed by the constructions *noun + preposition + noun in the accusative* (*centru de reciclare*) and *noun + adjective* (*reciclare enzimatică*). In fact, all 3 structures abovementioned are primary patterns of organisations and each of them further develops secondary patterns, which add specifications to Romanian terminology of waste recycling.

The formation of the terms included in the *Recycling our Waste* category is based on external means of lexical enrichment, more precisely, borrowings (*compostaj*). This aspect underlines a neological terminology, in the process of development. Another feature which supports the emergent character of this terminology is given by the occurrence of terminological variation, as shown in 4 instances previously discussed (*centru de colectare – centru de colectare a deșeurilor – punct de colectare a deșeurilor*).

In the light of the present research, situated within the elaboration and use of glossaries, we consider that these findings contribute to a better and thorough knowledge of a terminology less documented and studied in Romanian linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aciu, C., D. A. Iluțiu-Varvara, N. Cobirzan, A. Balog, 2014, "Recycling of Paper Waste in the Composition of Plastering Mortars", *Procedia Technology* 12, 295–300, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212017313006749 (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Bâca, I., L. M. Cioanca, 2016, "Cultura deșeurilor și a risipei în cadrul comunităților locale de pe Valea Bârgăului", in I. Boldea (ed.), *Globalization and National Identity. Studies on the Strategies of Intercultural Dialogue*, vol. 3. Târgu-Mureș: Arhipelag XXI Press, 1002–1012.

Cabré, M. T., 1993, *La terminología: teoría, metodología, aplicaciones*. Barcelona: Antártida/Empúries.

Căpățînă, C., C. M. Simonescu, 2006, *Depozitarea, tratarea și reciclarea deșeurilor și materialelor recuperabile*. București: Matrix Rom.

Howell, J. P., 2023, *Garbage in the Garden State*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Klöck, C., P. Castro, F. Weiler, L. Ø. Blaxekjær (eds.), 2020, *Coalitions in the Climate Change Negotiations*. London: Routledge.

Madhanagopal, D., C. T. Beer, B. R. Nikku, A. J. Pelser (eds), 2022, *Environment, Climate, and Social Justice: Perspectives and Practices from the Global South*. Singapore: Springer.

Ministerul Mediului, Apelor și Pădurilor – Guvernul României, 2023, *Planul național de acțiune pentru implementarea Strategiei naționale privind adaptarea la schimbările climatice pentru perioada 2023–2030 (PNASC 2023–2030)*, 3rd version, https://www.mmediu.ro/app/webroot/uploads/files/PNASC_v03.docx (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Ministerul Mediului, Apelor și Pădurilor – Guvernul României, 2023, *Strategia națională privind adaptarea la schimbările climatice pentru perioada 2023-2030 cu perspectiva anului 2050 (SNASC 2023–2030)*, 3rd version, https://www.mmediu.ro/app/webroot/uploads/files/SNASC_v03.docx (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Oroian I., A. Odagiu, I. Brașovean, P. Burduhos, 2009, "Gestiunea deșeurilor în România. Studiu de caz: implementarea SGD", *ProEnvironment* 4 (II), 235–242, https://journals.usamvcluj.ro/index.php/promediu/article/view/3657 (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Peya, M. I., 2022, *Nature's Ultimatum: The Stakes and Prospects of the United States' Urgent Return to the Climate Battle*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

DICTIONARIES AND GLOSSARIES

Centre Régional d'Information des Nations unies pour l'Europe Occidentale, 2023, *Dictionnaire du climat*, Réseau *Action Climat*, online version. Bruxelles: Nations Unies, https://dico.unric.org/fr/ (accessed on 01.08.2026).

FranceTerme, 2025, *300 termes clés pour les négociations environnementales et climatiques*, online version. Paris : Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France, Commission d'enrichissement de la langue française, Ministère de la Culture, https://www.culture.fr/franceterme/Nos-publications (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Maunder, W. J., 1992, *Dictionary of Global Climate Change*. New York: Springer, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/b102610 (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Office fédéral de l'environnement (OFEV), 2020, *Glossaire sur le climat. Notions de base pour la formation professionnelle*. Berne: Office fédéral de l'environnement (OFEV), https://www.bafu.admin.ch/dam/fr/sd-web/SCtEFm6MhfCL/glossar_klima.pdf (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement – PNUD, 2023, *Le Dictionnaire du Climat : un guide pratique sur le changement climatique*, online version. New York: Programme des Nations Unies pour le développement, https://climatepromise.undp.org/sites/default/files/research_report_document/FR%20WEB%20-%20The%20Climate%20Dictionary%20-%20Publication%20%281%29.pdf (accessed on 01.08.2026).

Termium, 2023, *Lexique sur les changements climatiques et la santé publique*, online version. Québec: Le Bureau de la traduction, https://www.btb.termiumplus.gc.ca/publications/changements-climatiques-sante-publique-fra.html (accessed on 01.08.2026).

United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2016, *Glossary of Climate Change Terms*, online version, https://19january2017snapshot.epa.gov/climatechange/glossary-climate-change-terms_.html#main-content (accessed on 01.08.2026).

RECYCLING OUR WASTE ENVIRONMENTAL TERMINOLOGY IN ROMANIAN. UPDATES TO A SPECIALISED GLOSSARY

Abstract

The present paper undergoes a terminological analysis, building on the framework provided by the *Communicative Theory of Terminology* (Cabré 1993), and investigates a specific thematic category, namely the section *Recycling our Waste* of the multilingual glossary *300 termes clés pour les négociations environnementales et climatiques* (*FranceTerme*). This study aims to: a) analyse the set of terms related to waste recycling in the field of *Environmental and Climate Negotiations* in Romanian, b) examine their morphosyntactic structure, and c) address terminological variation, an indicator of an emergent terminology. The research contributes to a better understanding of the Romanian terminology of *waste recycling*, within the context of the increasing importance that this activity achieves in contemporary society.