

a limited set of situations such as claims to specific social assistance by economically inactive EU-migrants or their request of specific social assistance at the beginning of their residence and before they found a job in the host Member State. More importantly and contrary to this development, the CJEU keeps strengthening rights and entitlements of those who want to be economically active, i.e. of EU migrant workers and self-employed persons. Thus, regardless of its change of approach in the specific cases *Dano*, *Alimanovic*, *Garcia-Nieto*, the CJEU remains opposed to the restrictions of rights of economically active EU-migrants as they were discussed and promised by EU statesmen at the European Council summit in February 2016. Thus, although it is the CJEU who is now blamed for limiting rights derived directly from EU-citizenship, the ball is now in the politicians' court as they want to intervene in the nature of integration much more than the CJEU ever did in its decisions.

Anna Brabcová, a recent graduate of the Faculty of Law, contributed an extract from her diploma thesis submitted in autumn 2015 and dedicated to the topic of “**Accession of the European Union to the European Convention on Human Rights. Examining the CJEU’s Approach in the Opinion 2/13. The Future of the EU-ECHR Accession Process**”. Her paper thus continues the debate on the matter of accession of the European Union (“EU”) to the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (“ECHR”) that has been for decades a hot topic of legal and academic discussions. On the 18th December 2014, the Court of Justice of the European Union (“CJEU”) issued its long awaited Opinion 2/13 where the CJEU ruled that the Draft agreement on the accession of the EU to the ECHR is not compatible with EU law. In the first part the paper examines the CJEU’s approach taken in its Opinion 2/13. It tries to see its reasoning from a different perspective which could lead to the conclusion that the CJEU is maybe not as selfish as it might seem at first sight. In the second part the paper foresees the development of future steps regarding the EU accession to the ECHR and provides an assessment of the so far offered solutions to get the EU-ECHR accession process out of its current knotty situation.

Václav Šmejkal*

Knoll, Vilém. Páni z Velhartic: Měli duši zvláštní - trochu drsná zdála se... Praha: Lidové noviny, 2015, 571 s.

This monograph, volume 13 from a series on Czech, Moravian and Silesian nobility, is focused on lords from Velhartice, mainly Bušek I and his son, Bušek II.

Authored by Vilém Knoll, this book has a poetic subtitle: in translation, it would read “Strange was their soul – a bit rough it seemed.” The author drew inspiration from Jan Neruda romance on Charles IV. And Bušek II did play host to Charles IV at the oak table of his castle Velhartice.

Both Bušeks of Velhartice deserve increased attention, being among friends and advisors to Charles IV, and both serving in important functions of the Czech kingdom – Bušek II was the master of the chamber, taking part in management of royal treasury, and later also the district chief officer in Upper Palatinate.

It is very fortunate that the author opens his monograph by depictions of Bušek II in cinematography and literature. He also includes a range of characteristics given to Bušek II by authors of these pieces. František Kubka, for example, described Bušek as “a man of courage and high morals, and a widely experienced knight.”

In his book, written (with interruptions) over several years, Vilém Knoll fructified his knowledge of history, genealogy, heraldry, and architecture. And the book is also a good proof of his erudition in legal history.

* JUDr. Vaclav Šmejkal, Ph.D., Faculty of Law, Charles University, Prague, Czech Republic

Knoll follows the rather obscure beginnings of the Velhartice lineage, going back to lords of Bor, their rise, and their fall. The story of Velhartice nobility in both its main line and side-lines is provided chronologically and in terms of economic and political conditions of Czech Middle Ages with overlaps to early modernity.

However, the focus of attention is rightly in the characters of Bušek I and Bušek II – it was in their lifetime that the lineage flourished the most. The author is also persuasive in descriptions of the destiny of Velhartice lords in late 14th century. In that time the last member of the main line of this lineage got himself (rather unfortunately) drawn into war on borders with Bavaria.

Let me focus now on aspects of legal history that could be unjustly disregarded. The history of Velhartice lords is not only affected by laws of inheritance, escheat, or feudal authorities. It also involves domain management, and “law of the state” establishing the status and competences of individual state officials.

Especially in case of Bušek II the author described in detail his role in state offices. As the author points out, the name of Bušek appears in no less than nine documents concerning in their contents the agenda of the chamber. These involved issues of tax alleviation, purchase and sale of real estates, feoffment issues, and the issue of taxes for the Jews. The name of Bušek also appears on many other documents, where he is listed among witnesses proving the contents of the document.

As mentioned above, Bušek managed a part of Czech Crown lands very important in economic terms – the “New Bohemia” with seat in Sulzbach. This area involved iron ore mining and also widely-used merchant routes.

Vilém Knoll also clarified numerous inaccuracies associated with Velhartice lords. He is quite credible in proving that the chief officer in Upper Palatinate and the master of Czech chamber was one person, not two, and this person was Bušek II.

Another clarified issue is proving the falsity of claims pointing to Bušek as the first manager of Prague St. Vitus cathedral. In this case it was not our Bušek, but another one – Bušek Linhart of Braškov, member of St. Vitus Metropolitan Chapter. It is his Bust, not one of Bušek II, that is displayed in triforium of Prague cathedral.

Very interesting passages include those concerning the court life during the reign of Charles IV, and also a testimony of Charles IV himself, describing in his own biography the actions of a “poltergeist” in old burgrave house of Prague castle. These actions were also witnessed by Bušek II of Velhartice – we can trust him, or not.

The author went through various sources, including archives, chronicles, and general literature. The book includes numerous notes and castle photographs, drawings of reconstructions, and ideal reconstructions of castles and keeps ruled by Velhartice lords who also influenced their architecture. The reader can also find a map of Velhartice dominion, and a well-arranged index.

This new book can be recommended to both academic public and all people interested in Czech medieval history. It is high in both academic and literary value, and as such will surely be a pleasure to read.

Karolina Adamová*

* Professor JUDr. PhDr. Karolina Adamová, DSc., Faculty of Law, University of West Bohemia, Pilsen, Czech Republic