AGORA International Journal of Juridical Sciences, http://univagora.ro/jour/index.php/aijjs
ISSN 1843-570X, E-ISSN 2067-7677
Vol. 19, No. 2 (2025), pp. 131-141

THE PATRIMONY IN THE LIGHT OF CURRENT LEGAL REGULATIONS

R.-A. HEPEȘ, R.-D. VIDICAN

Raul-Alexandru Hepeș[1], Roxana-Denisa Vidican[2]
[1] [2] Faculty of Juridical and Administrative Sciences, Agora University of Oradea, Romania and Doctoral School of Law, Titu Maiorescu University, Bucharest, Romania
[1] E-mail: raul_hepes@yahoo.com
[2] E-mail: vidican.roxana@yahoo.com

Abstract: Patrimony is one of the fundamental concepts of civil law, continuously evolving under the influence of economic, technological, and social transformations. From the classical conception of patrimony as a single legal universality, contemporary law has come to recognize autonomous patrimonial masses, the patrimony of affectation, as well as new forms of digital, cultural, and ecological patrimony. This article aims to analyze the concept of patrimony in the light of current legal regulations, focusing on the provisions of the New Civil Code, recent doctrinal developments, and the challenges generated by the digital economy and globalization.

Keywords: patrimony, patrimony of affectation, patrimonial masses, digital patrimony, cultural patrimony

Introduction

The concept of patrimony represents one of the cornerstones of civil law, functioning as an essential instrument for understanding legal relationships with economic content. From its earliest doctrinal formulations, patrimony has been conceived as the legal expression of a person's economic existence, encompassing the totality of rights and obligations capable of pecuniary evaluation (Hamangiu et al., 1996:12-14), (Malaurie et al., 2020:15-18). Far from being a purely theoretical construct, patrimony plays a decisive role in everyday legal practice, particularly in matters concerning obligations, liability, enforcement, insolvency, and succession.

Traditionally, civil law systems have approached patrimony through a classical and relatively rigid perspective, closely linked to the notion of legal personality. According to this view, each person is necessarily the holder of a single patrimony, conceived as a legal universality, independent from the individual assets that compose it. This classical theory, strongly influenced by French doctrine and jurisprudence, emphasized the unity and indivisibility of patrimony, assigning to it primarily the function of a general guarantee for creditors. For a long period of time, this conception proved sufficient, reflecting the economic realities of a society in which wealth was predominantly material and easily identifiable.

However, the profound transformations of contemporary society have progressively challenged this traditional understanding. The diversification of economic activities, the rise of professional and entrepreneurial autonomy, the development of complex financial instruments, and, more recently, the expansion of the digital economy has all contributed to a

reconfiguration of the patrimonial landscape. In this context, patrimony can no longer be perceived merely as a static and homogeneous legal construct, but rather as a dynamic structure, capable of internal organization and functional differentiation.

Romanian civil law has not remained isolated from these evolutions. The adoption of the New Civil Code marked a significant step (Baias et al., 2012:31-33) in the modernization of patrimonial theory, expressly defining patrimony and, at the same time, allowing for a more flexible internal structuring through the recognition of autonomous patrimonial masses, such as the patrimony of affectation. This legislative innovation reflects a broader European trend aimed at reconciling the classical principle of the unity of patrimony with the practical necessity of separating assets according to their economic destination and associated risks.

At the same time, the contemporary understanding of patrimony must also take into account the emergence of new categories of assets that challenge traditional legal classifications. Digital assets, including cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens, online accounts, databases, and other intangible resources, have acquired undeniable economic value and increasingly form part of individuals' and legal entities' patrimonial structures. European regulations such as the GDPR and the MiCA Regulation confirm this evolution, compelling legal systems to adapt patrimonial concepts to technological realities.

Beyond its individual dimension, patrimony also acquires a collective significance, particularly in relation to cultural and ecological values. Cultural heritage and natural resources are no longer viewed solely as objects of ownership or economic exploitation, but as shared assets whose protection serves the interests of present and future generations. This broader conception of patrimony reflects a shift from a purely individualistic approach toward one that integrates social responsibility and sustainable development.

In light of these considerations, the present article aims to examine the concept of patrimony in the context of current legal regulations, with a particular focus on Romanian civil law and its alignment with European legal developments. By analyzing the evolution of patrimonial theory, the institution of the patrimony of affectation, intra-patrimonial transfers, and the emergence of digital, cultural, and ecological patrimony, this study seeks to highlight the adaptability of civil law to contemporary challenges. Ultimately, the article argues that patrimony remains a fundamental legal concept, but one whose relevance depends on its capacity to evolve in response to economic, technological, and social change.

I. The notion of patrimony and its doctrinal evolution

In classical civil law theory, patrimony was conceived as a legal universality comprising the totality of rights and obligations with economic value belonging to a person. This conception was deeply rooted in the idea of legal personality, patrimony being regarded as an inherent attribute of the person, inseparable from its legal existence. As a consequence, patrimony was understood not as a mere aggregation of assets, but as an abstract legal construct, designed to reflect the economic dimension (Hamangiu et al., 1996:20-22) of the individual or legal entity.

A fundamental element of this classical approach was the principle of the unity of patrimony (Stoica, 2009:45-47). According to this principle, each person could be the holder of only one patrimony, regardless of the diversity of assets owned or obligations assumed. This unity was considered both necessary and logical, as patrimony served primarily as a general

guarantee for creditors. From this perspective, all the debtor's assets, present and future, formed a single pool against which creditors could enforce their claims, unless the law expressly provided otherwise. The indivisibility of patrimony thus ensured legal certainty and predictability in civil and commercial transactions.

The Romanian Civil Code of 1864 did not contain an express legal definition (Hamangiu, 1996:25-27) of patrimony. Nevertheless, Romanian doctrine succeeded in developing a coherent and robust theoretical framework, largely inspired by French legal thought and by the classical doctrine associated with the Napoleonic Code. Patrimony was described as a legal universality distinct from the individual goods composing it, a notion that allowed jurists to explain phenomena such as universal succession, subrogation, and the continuity of obligations irrespective of changes in the concrete composition of assets.

Within this classical framework, patrimony fulfilled a predominantly protective function in favor of creditors. Its role as a general guarantee justified the strict adherence to the principle of unity, as any fragmentation of patrimony was perceived as a potential threat to the security of legal relations. Consequently, traditional doctrine was reluctant to accept the idea that a person could dispose of several autonomous patrimonies, even when economic realities suggested the necessity of separating assets according to their destination or the risks associated with different activities.

However, over time, the rigidity of the classical conception began to reveal its limitations. The increasing complexity of economic life, the expansion of professional and entrepreneurial activities carried out by individuals, and the emergence of new forms of wealth called into question the adequacy of a strictly unitary view of patrimony. These developments highlighted the need for a more flexible legal approach, capable of accommodating differentiated economic functions within the same patrimonial framework.

The entry into force of the New Romanian Civil Code marked a decisive moment in the evolution of patrimonial theory. For the first time, the legislator expressly enshrined the notion of patrimony, defining it as the totality of rights and obligations that can be evaluated in money and belong to a person. This explicit definition did not merely codify a doctrinal concept, but also reflected a modern understanding of patrimony as a dynamic legal structure.

Moreover, by recognizing the possibility of organizing patrimony into distinct patrimonial masses, the New Civil Code opened the door to more flexible arrangements, adapted to the realities of the modern economy. While maintaining the fundamental principle that patrimony remains linked to the legal personality of its holder, the legislator acknowledged that internal differentiation is sometimes necessary in order to balance the interests of the patrimonial holder with those of creditors and third parties. This evolution illustrates a shift from a purely abstract and rigid conception of patrimony toward a functional and pragmatic approach, better suited to contemporary legal and economic challenges.

II. The patrimony of affectation

The patrimony of affectation represents one of the most significant and conceptually innovative (Pop, 2015:210-215), (Baias et al., 2012) developments in contemporary civil law. By departing from the rigid classical understanding of patrimony as an indivisible legal universality, this institution introduces a functional approach, allowing certain assets and liabilities to be allocated to a specific purpose within the broader patrimonial framework of a

single holder. Rather than creating a completely separate patrimony, the patrimony of affectation operates as an autonomous patrimonial mass, internally differentiated but still legally connected to the same person.

The theoretical foundations of the patrimony of affectation can be traced to comparative law, particularly to doctrines that recognized the possibility of allocating assets to a specific purpose (Zweckvermögen), as well as to modern developments in French law related to fiduciary arrangements. These influences demonstrate a broader European tendency to reconcile the principle of the unity of patrimony with the practical necessity of organizing assets according to their economic destination and associated risks. Romanian civil law has embraced this evolution by formally recognizing the patrimony of affectation as a legal instrument adapted to contemporary economic realities.

The necessity of the patrimony of affectation becomes particularly evident in the context of liberal professions and independent economic activities. Professionals such as lawyers, doctors, notaries, or independent consultants often engage in activities that involve significant economic risks. Subjecting their entire personal patrimony to professional liabilities would not only be disproportionate, but also socially undesirable, as it could deter individuals from engaging in such activities. The patrimony of affectation allows for a clear delimitation between assets used for professional purposes and those destined for personal or family life, thus ensuring a more equitable distribution of risks.

At the same time, the patrimony of affectation does not operate solely in favor of the patrimonial holder. On the contrary, it also serves an essential protective function for creditors. By clearly identifying the assets allocated to a specific activity, creditors are provided with transparency and legal certainty regarding the extent of the guarantee available to satisfy their claims. This balance between the protection of the holder and the safeguarding of creditors' interests reflects the underlying rationale of the institution, which seeks to harmonize individual economic freedom with the requirements of legal security.

Furthermore, the patrimony of affectation proves particularly relevant in the context of the modern economy, characterized by diversification of activities and the growing importance of intangible assets. Independent professionals may allocate intellectual property rights, digital assets, or specific financial resources to their professional patrimony, thereby adapting the institution to new forms of economic value. In this sense, the patrimony of affectation emerges not merely as a technical legal construction, but as a flexible tool capable of evolving alongside economic and technological developments.

In conclusion, the patrimony of affectation reflects a fundamental shift in the understanding of patrimonial structures within civil law. While preserving the conceptual link between patrimony and legal personality, it introduces a pragmatic mechanism that allows for internal differentiation based on purpose and risk. This institution exemplifies the capacity of contemporary civil law to adapt classical concepts to modern economic realities, ensuring both efficiency and fairness in patrimonial relations.

III. Intra-patrimonial transfer

Intra-patrimonial transfer, expressly regulated by Article 32 of the New Romanian Civil Code (Baias et al., 2012), refers to the movement of rights and obligations between distinct patrimonial masses belonging to the same holder. This mechanism operates exclusively within

the framework of a single patrimony and must be clearly distinguished from inter-patrimonial transfers, which involve the alienation of assets to a different legal subject. By clarifying this distinction, the legislator has provided an essential conceptual and practical tool for the internal organization of patrimonial structures.

A key aspect of Article 32 lies in the express stipulation that intra-patrimonial transfer does not constitute an alienation. This clarification has significant legal consequences, as it excludes the application of rules governing translative acts, such as sale, donation, or exchange. Prior to the entry into force of the New Civil Code, the absence of an explicit regulation often led to the assimilation of internal patrimonial reorganizations to acts of alienation, resulting in unnecessary formal requirements, increased transaction costs, and, in some cases, unjustified fiscal burdens. The current regulation remedies these shortcomings by recognizing the purely internal character of such transfers.

From a functional perspective, intra-patrimonial transfer serves as a mechanism of patrimonial mobility, enabling the holder to adapt the internal structure of his patrimony to changing economic and professional needs. For instance, assets initially belonging to the general patrimony may be allocated to a patrimony of affectation dedicated to a professional activity, or conversely, may be reintegrated into the general patrimony following the cessation of that activity. In all such cases, ownership remains unchanged, the transfer reflecting only a modification in the economic destination of the assets.

At the same time, the regulation of intra-patrimonial transfer is carefully balanced by safeguards designed to protect the rights of creditors. Article 32 expressly provides that such transfers may not prejudice creditors, who retain their guarantees over the patrimonial mass corresponding to the obligations incurred. Consequently, intra-patrimonial transfer cannot be used as an instrument for fraud or for the artificial shielding of assets from enforcement. Where such abuse occurs, creditors may rely on general legal remedies, including actions aimed at challenging fraudulent acts.

The importance of intra-patrimonial transfer is further accentuated in the context of the contemporary economy, characterized by the diversification of assets and the increasing relevance of intangible goods. Digital assets, intellectual property rights, and financial instruments may be internally reallocated between patrimonial masses in order to reflect their actual economic function. In this sense, Article 32 provides the necessary legal flexibility to accommodate modern forms of wealth management without undermining the stability of patrimonial relations.

In conclusion, the regulation of intra-patrimonial transfer represents a significant step in the modernization of Romanian civil law. By acknowledging the legitimacy of internal patrimonial reorganizations and by excluding their qualification as alienations, the legislator has reduced formalism and enhanced legal certainty. At the same time, by maintaining robust protections for creditors, this institution achieves a fair balance between patrimonial autonomy and the requirements of legal security, illustrating the adaptive capacity of civil law to contemporary economic realities.

IV. Digital patrimony

The rapid development of the digital economy has profoundly transformed the traditional understanding of wealth and, implicitly, the legal concept of patrimony. Unlike classical assets, which are typically corporeal, geographically located, and easily identifiable, digital assets exist in an immaterial environment, often detached from any specific physical medium. Nevertheless, despite their intangible nature, such assets have acquired undeniable economic value and play an increasingly important role in the patrimonial structures of both individuals and legal entities.

Digital patrimony may be broadly defined as the totality of rights and assets of an economic nature existing in digital or electronic form, over which a person holds legally recognized powers of use, control, or disposition. This category encompasses a wide range of elements, including cryptocurrencies, non-fungible tokens (NFTs), digital wallets, online trading accounts, databases, domain names, cloud-stored content, and social media accounts with monetizable value. In many cases, these assets represent a substantial, if not predominant, component of a person's overall patrimony.

Cryptocurrencies constitute one of the most visible and controversial manifestations of digital patrimony. Initially perceived as speculative instruments operating outside traditional legal frameworks, cryptocurrencies have gradually gained recognition as assets capable of economic valuation and legal relevance. The adoption of Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) marks a decisive step toward the formal integration of crypto-assets into the European legal order. By establishing rules on issuance, trading, and supervision, MiCA implicitly confirms the patrimonial character of crypto-assets, treating them as elements capable of being held, transferred, and administered within a legal framework.

Similarly, non-fungible tokens introduce a new dimension to digital patrimony by enabling the individualization of digital assets through blockchain technology. NFTs allow the attribution of exclusivity and traceability to digital creations, such as artworks, music, or virtual real estate, thereby transforming digital scarcity into economic value. From a patrimonial perspective, NFTs challenge traditional categories of property law, yet their economic function aligns closely with classical patrimonial assets, justifying their inclusion within the patrimony of their holder.

Beyond crypto-assets, digital patrimony also includes rights over digital platforms and online accounts. A social media account with a large audience, a monetized video channel, or an e-commerce platform can generate significant income and may be transferred, inherited, or even pledged as security. Although contractual terms imposed by platform providers may limit certain forms of transfer, the economic reality remains that such accounts function as valuable patrimonial assets. Their legal qualification raises complex issues concerning ownership, contractual freedom, and the limits imposed by private digital governance.

Another essential component of digital patrimony is represented by data. In contemporary society, data has become a strategic economic resource, often described as the "new oil" of the digital economy. Personal data, business data, and aggregated datasets possess significant commercial value, being exploited for advertising, analytics, and technological development. While the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) primarily aims to protect fundamental rights and freedoms, its regulatory framework implicitly acknowledges the economic value of data. The recognition of data subjects' rights over their personal data

contributes to the emerging view that data, although not property in the classical sense, forms part of a person's digital patrimony.

The inclusion of digital assets within patrimony also raises important questions regarding succession and enforcement. Upon the death of an individual, digital assets such as cryptocurrencies, online accounts, or digital libraries do not automatically follow the traditional paths of succession unless specific measures have been taken. Access credentials, encryption, and platform policies may effectively prevent heirs from exercising their rights, leading to practical obstacles that classical patrimonial theory was not designed to address. As a result, contemporary doctrine increasingly emphasizes the need to integrate digital patrimony into succession planning and inheritance law.

Moreover, digital patrimony presents unique challenges in terms of protection and administration. Unlike physical assets, digital assets are particularly vulnerable to cyberattacks, data loss, and unauthorized access. The absence of centralized registries, the reliance on private keys, and the cross-border nature of digital platforms complicate both legal protection and enforcement mechanisms. In response, legal scholarship and practice have begun exploring technological solutions such as blockchain-based registries, smart contracts, and digital escrow mechanisms as tools for securing and managing digital patrimony.

In conclusion, digital patrimony represents a fundamental extension of the classical concept of patrimony, reflecting the deep structural changes brought about by technological innovation. While traditional civil law categories provide a useful foundation, they require reinterpretation and adaptation in order to accommodate the specific characteristics of digital assets. European regulatory initiatives such as MiCA and GDPR illustrate an emerging consensus that digital assets possess genuine patrimonial value and must be integrated into the legal order accordingly. As digitalization continues to reshape economic relations, the recognition and regulation of digital patrimony will remain a central challenge for contemporary civil law.

V. Cultural and ecological patrimony

Beyond its individual and economic dimension, patrimony (Law no. 422/2001) also has a collective component that reflects the shared identity, memory, and long-term interests of a community. Cultural and ecological patrimony represent forms of collective wealth whose value exceeds the strictly patrimonial logic of private ownership. They embody the continuity between past, present, and future generations, and they raise complex legal questions related to the relationship between private rights and public interests, the role of the state as custodian, and the emergence of intergenerational responsibilities.

V.1. Cultural patrimony: identity, continuity, and public interest

Cultural patrimony includes both tangible and intangible elements (UNESCO, 2005) that constitute the historical and symbolic capital of a community. Tangible heritage may comprise monuments, archaeological sites, historical buildings, works of art, archives, and museum collections, while intangible heritage involves languages, traditions, rituals, craftsmanship, and forms of artistic expression transmitted from generation to generation. The legal recognition of intangible cultural heritage is particularly significant, as it confirms that

patrimonial value is not necessarily linked to materiality, but may also arise from social meaning, cultural continuity, and collective recognition.

The legal regime of cultural patrimony is characterized by a strong public-interest component. Even when heritage assets are privately owned, their cultural significance may justify substantial limitations on the owner's powers of use and disposition. Such limitations—ranging from conservation obligations to restrictions on alteration, demolition, or export—reflect the idea that cultural patrimony cannot be fully assimilated to ordinary assets. In this sense, cultural heritage constitutes a paradigmatic example of the transformation of property law from an absolute right into a functionally oriented institution, shaped by social and constitutional values.

Internationally, the protection of cultural patrimony is supported by a complex network of conventions that recognize the universal value of heritage and encourage cooperation between states. These instruments promote standards for conservation, prevent illicit trafficking of cultural goods, and provide frameworks for safeguarding both tangible and intangible heritage. At the national level, domestic legislation typically establishes procedures for classification, protection, and restoration, while also defining institutional competencies and sanctions for heritage-related violations. In many jurisdictions, including Romania, the protection of cultural patrimony is increasingly reinforced by judicial practice, particularly in disputes involving urban development, unauthorized interventions, or neglect of historically protected buildings.

V.2. Ecological patrimony: from resource exploitation to intergenerational responsibility

Ecological patrimony refers to natural assets and environmental values—such as biodiversity, forests, water resources, protected habitats, landscapes, and ecosystems—that form the natural foundation of collective life. Unlike traditional patrimonial assets, ecological patrimony is often not easily commodified, since its value cannot be fully captured through market mechanisms. Ecological patrimony therefore requires a legal framework capable of integrating economic development with the preservation of environmental integrity[1].

In contemporary legal thought, the emergence of ecological patrimony reflects a shift from viewing nature as a mere resource for exploitation toward recognizing it as a shared heritage that must be preserved for future generations. This perspective is closely linked to the principles of sustainable development, prevention, and precaution. It also supports the increasing tendency of courts and legislatures to impose stricter obligations on both public authorities and private actors in matters of environmental protection, especially in cases involving deforestation, pollution, habitat destruction, or unsustainable exploitation.

The collective character of ecological patrimony becomes particularly evident in the transboundary dimension of environmental harm. Pollution, climate change, and biodiversity loss do not stop at national borders, making environmental protection a matter of international cooperation and shared responsibility. In this context, ecological patrimony is not merely a national concern but a global one, supported by international agreements and regional frameworks. Within the European Union, environmental directives and regulatory instruments

[1] Environmental Protection Law no. 137/1995, republished.

establish binding standards for conservation, assessment of environmental impact, and the protection of habitats and species, thereby reinforcing the juridical status of ecological patrimony.

V.3. The tension between private rights and collective patrimony

Both cultural and ecological patrimony illustrate a structural tension between private autonomy and collective interests. Owners of heritage buildings may seek to develop or monetize their assets, while environmental regulations may restrict land use or impose costly compliance requirements. Yet these restrictions are not arbitrary; they are justified by the exceptional nature of patrimonial goods whose value is collective and whose degradation generates irreversible harm.

From a civil-law perspective, this tension challenges the classical dichotomy between public and private law. Cultural and ecological patrimony require hybrid legal solutions, combining property rules with administrative constraints, criminal sanctions, and civil liability mechanisms. Increasingly, doctrinal analysis emphasizes that patrimony, in its collective form, must be understood not only as a set of rights but also as a sphere of duties—duties to protect, conserve, and transmit. This approach contributes to the conceptual evolution of patrimony from a purely individualistic category to one that integrates social solidarity and intergenerational justice.

V.4. Digitalization as a tool for conservation and promotion

Digitalization provides new instruments for the conservation, documentation, and dissemination of cultural and ecological patrimony. In the cultural sphere, digitized archives, virtual museums, 3D scanning of monuments, and digital catalogues enable the preservation of heritage even when physical assets are endangered by degradation, natural disasters, or armed conflict. These tools enhance accessibility and democratize cultural participation, allowing heritage to be experienced beyond geographical and social limitations.

In the ecological sphere, digital technologies enable advanced monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. Satellite imagery, drones, sensors, and AI-based analytics can detect deforestation, illegal construction, and pollution in real time, supporting both preventive measures and accountability. Moreover, digital platforms facilitate public participation, enabling communities to report environmental harm and to engage in heritage protection initiatives. However, digitalization also raises new legal questions related to data governance, authenticity, cybersecurity, and the ownership of digital reproductions of heritage assets.

V.5. Concluding remarks

Cultural and ecological patrimony represent essential dimensions of collective patrimony, grounded in identity, continuity, and shared responsibility. Their legal protection reflects a broader transformation of patrimonial theory, in which patrimony is no longer understood solely as an individual economic universality, but also as a category encompassing collective values and intergenerational obligations. In the contemporary context, legal systems must continue to refine the balance between private rights and public interest, while also integrating technological instruments that can strengthen conservation and promote sustainable management of collective patrimony.

Conclusions

Patrimony remains one of the foundational concepts of civil law, serving as a central analytical tool for understanding legal relationships with economic content. However, as demonstrated throughout this study, patrimony can no longer be approached as a static or purely abstract legal universality. From its classical formulation as a single and indivisible entity linked to legal personality, the concept of patrimony has undergone a process of continuous adaptation, reflecting the profound transformations of contemporary society.

The evolution of patrimonial theory illustrates a gradual shift from rigidity to functional flexibility. While the classical conception emphasized unity, indivisibility, and the role of patrimony as a general guarantee for creditors, modern civil law increasingly acknowledges the legitimacy of internal differentiation. Institutions such as the patrimony of affectation and intra-patrimonial transfer exemplify this evolution, allowing assets and liabilities to be organized according to their economic purpose without severing the fundamental link between patrimony and legal personality. This functional approach enhances economic efficiency while preserving legal certainty and creditor protection.

At the same time, the emergence of digital patrimony challenges traditional legal categories and compels a reassessment of the boundaries of patrimonial law. Digital assets, data, and platform-based economic activities demonstrate that patrimonial value is no longer dependent on materiality or territorial localization. European regulatory frameworks, particularly in the fields of data protection and crypto-assets, confirm that digital elements have acquired full patrimonial relevance and must be integrated into the civil-law order. This development underscores the need for doctrinal reinterpretation and legislative responsiveness in order to ensure effective protection, transmission, and enforcement of digital patrimonial rights. Beyond the individual sphere, the analysis of cultural and ecological patrimony reveals a further expansion of the patrimonial concept toward collective and intergenerational dimensions. Cultural heritage and environmental assets embody values that transcend individual ownership and economic exploitation, justifying legal regimes centered on public interest, sustainability, and shared responsibility. In this context, patrimony evolves from a mere collection of rights into a framework of rights and duties, reflecting broader constitutional and societal values. Digitalization, while introducing new legal challenges, also offers powerful tools for the conservation, monitoring, and promotion of collective patrimony.

In 2025, addressing patrimony requires a comprehensive and integrative vision capable of reconciling legal tradition with contemporary realities. Civil law must continue to preserve the conceptual coherence of patrimony as a fundamental institution, while simultaneously embracing flexibility, technological innovation, and social responsibility. The ongoing transformation of patrimonial structures demonstrates that patrimony is not an outdated concept, but rather a dynamic and adaptable legal category, essential for responding to the economic, technological, and ecological challenges of modern society (Malaurie et al., 2020:15-18), Zimmermann, 1996:60-62).

Ultimately, the relevance of patrimony in contemporary civil law lies precisely in its capacity to evolve without losing its core function. As both an individual and collective construct, patrimony remains a reflection of societal change and a measure of the law's ability to adapt to new forms of value, risk, and responsibility. This adaptability will continue to define the role of patrimony in civil law theory and practice in the years to come.

REFERENCES

A. Romanian doctrine (core)

1. **Liviu Pop**, *Tratat de drept civil. Obligațiile*, vol. I–II, Universul Juridic, Bucharest, 2015.
2. **V. Stoica**, *Drept civil. Drepturile reale principale*, C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2009.
3. **Fl. A. Baias**, E. Chelaru, R. Constantinovici, I. Macovei (eds.), *Noul Cod civil. Comentariu pe articole*, C.H. Beck, Bucharest, 2012.
4. **C. Hamangiu**, I. Rosetti-Bălănescu, Al. Băicoianu, *Tratat de drept civil român*, vol. I, All Beck, Bucharest, 1996.
5. **G.N. Luțescu**, *Teoria generală a drepturilor reale*, Bucharest, 1947.

B. Comparative and European doctrine

6. **Ph. Malaurie**, **L. Aynès**, *Les biens*, Defrénois, Paris, 2020.
7. **R. Zimmermann**, *The Law of Obligations: Roman Foundations of the Civilian Tradition*, Oxford University Press, 1996.

C. Digital patrimony / data / crypto-assets

8. **European Commission**, *Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA)*.

D. Cultural and ecological patrimony

9. **UNESCO**, *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*, Paris, 1972.
10. **Council of Europe**, *Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society (Faro Convention)*, 2005.

E. Romanian legislation

11. **Romanian Civil Code**, Law no. 287/2009, republished.
12. **Law no. 422/2001** on the protection of historical monuments.
13. **Environmental Protection Law no. 137/1995**, republished.