HiLL PUBLISHING

Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science, 2026, 10(6), 663-671
https://www.hillpublisher.com/Journals/jhass/
ISSN Online: 2576-0548
ISSN Print: 2576-0556

Judicial Autonomy and Central-local Relations in Late Medieval Bristol: A Study Centered on the Charter of 1373

Haoran Wang

Institute of European Civilization, Tianjin Normal University, Tianjin 300387, China.

How to cite this paper: Haoran Wang. (2026) Judicial Autonomy and Central-local Relations in Late Medieval Bristol: A Study Centered on the Charter of 1373. *Journal of Humanities, Arts and Social Science*, 10(6), 663-671.
DOI: 10.26855/jhass.2026.06.009

Received: April 28, 2026
Accepted: May 25, 2026
Published: June 30, 2026

***Corresponding author:** Haoran Wang, Institute of European Civilization, Tianjin Normal University, Tianjin 300387, China.

© 2026 by the author(s).
This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives (CC BY-NC-ND) license, which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not modified or adapted.
https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

Abstract

In the late medieval period, because its territory straddled two counties, Bristol faced persistent fragmentation of judicial administration, which seriously hampered its trade and economic growth. Thanks to its long-standing contributions to the Crown, such as the substantial customs revenues, the provision of ships, and logistical support, Bristol accumulated significant political and military leverage. Drawing on this, the town successfully petitioned for a royal charter in 1373, which made it one of the earliest cities outside London in medieval England to be elevated to county corporate status. The charter established an autonomy system centered on the mayor and gradually enabled the development of a legal framework shaped by the needs of a commercial city. At the same time, the Crown retained ultimate authority of review, preserving mechanisms of oversight and control. This embedded form of autonomy operated within a framework of mutual dependence and restraint, producing a mutually beneficial outcome. The monarchy strengthened its centralization of authority while securing reliable economic and military backing; meanwhile, the city gained greater control over its judicial and fiscal affairs and was able to flourish continuously under the leadership of its urban elite. Analyzing the content and implications of the 1373 charter from a judicial perspective offers valuable insight into the dynamics of central-local relations in late medieval England and provides an important case study for research on urban history and local autonomy.

Keywords

Late medieval; Bristol; central-local relations; autonomy; charter

1. Introduction

As an important port city in medieval England, Bristol, by virtue of its advantageous geographical position and flourishing overseas trade, became a unique urban center of distinctive significance within the kingdom. It was known as "the Queen's Chamber" (Latimer, 1909), a designation that reflects the city's prominent status in the political and economic structure of the realm.

The constitutional nature of Bristol and its legal framework were fundamentally grounded in the privileges granted through royal charters. Among all the charters, the 1373 charter was of particular significance. Existing research suggested that it was both a legal document granted by the monarchy and a turning point for Bristol to establish its independent political identity, enhancing the city's internal autonomy (Hartrich, 2017; Bevan, 2013; Lee, 2007; Hambleton, Sweeting, & Thom, 2022). On the one hand, the charter laid the institutional foundation for Bristol's subsequent development and its administrative and judicial practices, and a number of studies have emphasized the vitality

of its local jurisdiction (Goddard & Phipps, 2019; Liberman, 2019; Lyes, 2006; Nicolson, 1970; Angelucci, Meraglia, & Voigtländer, 2022; Sharp, 2025). On the other hand, the charter also shaped the way in which Bristol was perceived by the central government, namely as a unit that possessed a quasi- "partnership" status in fiscal and political terms. Relevant research tended to interpret Bristol's autonomy as a form of political exchange under the pressure of royal financial and military needs. However, such interpretations often neglect the city's own perspective and fail to regard autonomy as a dynamic process jointly constructed by both the monarchy and the urban community (Godwin, 2015; Fleming, 2013; Liddy, 2005; Pounds, 2005; Sherborne, 1965; Winter, 2024; De Ruysscher, 2023).

In light of this, the 1373 charter constituted a crucial point in examining both the mechanisms of internal judicial governance in Bristol during the late Middle Ages and the interaction between urban authority and royal power. Building on previous research, this article draws upon the charter, municipal archives, and other historical materials, taking the 1373 charter as a key moment in the formalization of Bristol's judicial autonomy. This article will analyze the acquisition, substance, and political significance of Bristol's judicial autonomy from the perspective of central-local relations, thereby highlighting the city's uniqueness and its importance as a representative model of judicial autonomy.

2. Bristol's Judicial Predicament before 1373 and Its Relationship with Central Authority

Due to geographical limitations, Bristol faced internal conflicts and jurisdictional disputes, which not only led to judicial backwardness but also created considerable obstacles to commercial activity. This situation was resolved through a charter in 1373, but it was not achieved overnight. Rather, it emerged out of a prolonged period of interaction between the town and the Crown in matters of finance and military service, together with the gradual accumulation of earlier charters and privileges.

2.1 Jurisdiction Dilemma: The Peculiarities of Bristol's Administrative Geography

The jurisdictional dilemma faced by Bristol in the 14th century stemmed from the contradiction between its unique geographical location and the complex feudal power structure of medieval England. Bristol was divided into two parts by the River Avon: the north bank belonged to Gloucestershire, and the south bank belonged to Somerset (Little, 1954). This geographical division not only led to frequent armed conflicts between the two banks of the River Avon, but also directly resulted in the fragmentation of judicial and administrative jurisdiction. At that time, according to the county system of medieval England, Bristol was administratively under the joint jurisdiction of two counties; in judicial affairs, they still needed to be accountable to the sheriffs of two counties separately, and urban residents needed to accept judicial assignments from different county courts according to their place of residence.

The distinctive administrative geography had brought contradictions and difficulties to the judiciary in Bristol. Due to being divided into two counties, citizens had to travel to distant places to participate in county courts, juries, investigations, and circuit trials during judicial proceedings. This long journey was time-consuming and costly, which not only made the judicial process cumbersome and inefficient, but also seriously interfered with citizens' commercial activities. Even citizens could evade responsibility by transferring their property to another county jurisdiction in order to evade law enforcement. When the King instructed the Gloucestershire sheriff to execute his orders within the city, the citizens of Bristol transferred their belongings to Temple Street in Somerset, as it was neither under the jurisdiction of the Gloucestershire sheriff nor within the jurisdiction of the Bristol City Mayor, and neither party could enforce royal orders (Liddy, 1999). This approach not only increased the difficulty of law enforcement, but also had a negative impact on the economic situation of the city. The Crown also acknowledged in the charter that judicial requirements forced the citizens of the town to attend court hearings outside of Bristol, which meant that they sometimes could not pay attention to the management of their own ships and commerce (Harding, 1930). Beneath this formal wording lay a broader and longstanding concern shared by both the municipal authorities and the royal government: the town's unusual geographical position had produced persistent tensions in judicial and administrative governance.

The deeper contradiction lay in the structural conflict between medieval urban autonomy and the feudal county system. As a borough, Bristol's commonalty attempted to obtain unified jurisdiction through a charter, which was actually a challenge to the traditional county aristocratic power and church privileges. For example, St. Augustine's Abbey on the south bank of the River Avon had long claimed jurisdiction over the surrounding area and had had long-standing conflicts with the city government (Fleming, 2000). This multi-party jurisdictional pattern threatened

the control of urban elites over local affairs.

This case reveals the typical contradictions in the development of medieval English cities, the tension between the natural division of geographical space and the artificial feudal administrative divisions, as well as the structural conflict between urban economic expansion needs and multi-level jurisdictional systems. The experience of Bristol showed that the promotion of urban autonomy often started with solving specific jurisdictional difficulties, and the bargaining between the Crown and the local government became a key driving force for institutional change.

2.2 Background of Petition: Central-Local Interaction through Finance and Military Service

The interaction between the central and local governments adhered to the principle of "mutual benefit", and cities must first pledge allegiance to the Crown. Among various dimensions of contribution, support in the fields of finance and military was particularly prominent, and Bristol played a loyal and important role as a supporter of the Crown in these two areas, thus establishing its special position in the kingdom system.

Bristol was both a natural harbor and an industrial hub. Due to its convenience and safety, it became a major port in the western part of England and had a special impact on history (Hunt, 1898). As an important trading center in medieval England, Bristol's prosperous overseas trade brought huge tariff revenues to the Crown. In the 13th century, Bristol paid tariffs on a total of 2055 tons of wine. Bristol merchants were required to pay 2 pence in customs duty to the King for every 100 pieces of iron (Veale, 1938). In the mid-14th century, fabric exports accounted for 30%-40% of the country's total, while also engaging in wool, leather, and other commodities, gradually becoming an important trading hub city in Britain (Sherborne, 1971). After the outbreak of the Hundred Years' War, a large amount of wool resources that were originally exported to England flowed domestically, and Bristol took this opportunity to become an important production hub for the domestic textile industry. These commercial contributions significantly increased the Crown's recognition of Bristol's importance.

In terms of military affairs, Bristol continued to supply various military vessels and strategic funds to the royal army. With its unique geographical and resource advantages, it became an important military logistics base that the Crown relied on. As the only natural deep-water port in the southwest of England, it boasted excellent shelter conditions and large berthing capacity, making it the most ideal ship anchorage in the country. On the one hand, it undertook the key responsibility of cross-regional transportation of military supplies, delivering weapons, food, and other supplies to military strongholds in various regions. On the other hand, it provided a stable base for royal fleets, functioning as an important centre for naval deployment and recuperation. Furthermore, during the reign of King Henry II in the twelfth century, the Crown granted the citizens of Bristol the right to hold and govern the city of Dublin in Ireland as a colonial settlement, which became a vital rear base for English military operations there (Cronne, 1946). As Dublin served as England's principal military foothold in Ireland, Bristol subsequently became a vital place for maintaining military operations and consolidating English authority there. This further strengthened Bristol's strategic significance on a national scale and deepened royal attention toward the city.

With the central local interactive link built through fiscal and military cooperation, Bristol had always held an important position in the dual system of military defense and economic development in England. It was under the support of this institutional interaction that Bristol gradually accumulated political capital to make various requests for concessions to the Crown.

2.3 Preliminary Background: Charters Granted to Bristol before 1373

By the fourteenth century, Bristol had accumulated more than twenty royal charters. This gradual expansion of legal privileges and economic autonomy provided the essential institutional and social foundations for the city's transformation into a county corporate in 1373.

In the sphere of trade and economic privilege, Bristol obtained a variety of exemptions from customs and local financial obligations. Royal charters repeatedly confirmed the city's exemption from payments such as murage, the tax levied for the maintenance of town walls, and pannage, the fee associated with pasturing pigs in woodland areas. (Harding, 1930) In terms of judiciary and autonomy, the charter of 1317 was particularly significant. It confirmed Bristol's right to conduct the view of frankpledge, a system under which groups of townsmen collectively guaranteed one another's observance of the law, while offences committed by members were handled within local courts. This privilege effectively granted Bristol an important degree of judicial authority over the regulation of market society. It also demonstrated Bristol's position as a commercial center that required independent handling of commercial disputes.

Although Bristol had earlier obtained a series of royal charters, these measures did not fundamentally resolve the city's judicial difficulties. Nevertheless, the cumulative effect of these privileges ultimately paved the way for a decisive transformation in Bristol's political status. In 1373, Bristol was granted the status of a county corporate, thereby acquiring administrative authority and governmental autonomy equivalent to that of a county.

In short, Bristol was long embroiled in jurisdictional conflicts during the late Middle Ages, and the governance difficulties caused by geographical division became a structural constraint on urban development. At the same time, the relationship between the city and the Crown reflected a reciprocal nature centered on privilege granting and resource supply: Bristol, as an important shipping base and creditor of the Crown, continued to provide critical support to the monarchy in the financial and military fields; the Crown, on the other hand, rewarded Bristol by granting and safeguarding city privileges, particularly in terms of judicial autonomy, in exchange for sustained and generous financial and shipping assistance. This mutual benefit mechanism based on the exchange of interests encouraged both parties to remain committed to maintaining a stable cooperative relationship. The above characteristics run through the entire 15th century and even longer, becoming a significant pattern of continuity and typicality in the relationship between Bristol and the Crown.

3. The Institutionalisation of Bristol's Judicial Autonomy and Central Restraint under the Charter of 1373

The charter of 1373 was not granted abruptly, but emerged from a long process of negotiation and political bargaining between Bristol's urban elite and the Crown. Citizens expressed their demands through petitions, and the Crown responded based on financial and strategic considerations, integrating them into the kingdom's system through institutionalized means to maintain national unity and local stability.

3.1 The Acquisition of the Bristol Charter in 1373

In 1373, Bristol submitted a petition to obtain a charter. The petition was submitted to the King by the mayor, sheriff, and municipal officials of Bristol. The petition stated that the cross-county distribution of administrative geography required citizens to travel to Gloucester and Ilchester, which are about 30 leagues away, to attend county courts, juries, and investigations (Bickley, 1900). This obligation was not only time-consuming and dangerous, but also seriously affected the shipping and commercial management of citizens, especially in winter, and caused significant damage to Bristol's economy. Therefore, the core demand of the petition was to address the issue of interruptions in economic and trade activities due to external judicial obligations.

The petition also reflected a deeper level of political rhetoric. As the historian R. B. Dobson had described, the granting of urban charters could be understood as a process of "bargaining" between the Crown and municipal officials, in which "one party (the town) secured advantages that the other party (the Crown) had not fully anticipated." (Dobson, 1977). Bristol's demands emerged at a particularly opportune moment, coinciding with the Crown's central concerns in the early 1370s, especially anxieties surrounding the renewed intensification of the Hundred Years' War and the vulnerability of overseas trade routes (Sherborne, 1969). The charter of 1373 itself makes this connection explicit. It specifically acknowledged that the maritime activities of Bristol's burgesses had long rendered valuable service to the royal government and had provided important support for the Crown's overseas military operations.

After the petition was submitted, the Crown quickly responded. A few weeks later, considering Bristol's commitment to providing ships and loans to support the war, as well as its past shipping and other services, the king approved the request. Finally, by the end of September 1373, the boundaries of Bristol County were officially determined through a charter and a nearly complete system of urban autonomy was established. It clearly stipulated that no official from the former Gloucestershire and Somerset counties may enter Bristol for any reason to exercise their powers. At the same time, the charter explicitly declared that all rights and customary laws previously granted by successive kings remained fully valid. The charter also came with a highly detailed boundary report, which eliminated future territorial disputes. All these terms were ultimately officially approved and confirmed, and their legal effectiveness was guaranteed to the greatest extent.

In short, the charter of 1373 was the pinnacle of Bristol's autonomy history, far from a simple list of rights; it effectively created a constitutional framework for Bristol's urban government. It elevated Bristol from an ordinary commercial town to a county-level city with high self-governance capabilities and direct obedience to the monarchy by granting comprehensive autonomy in administration, judiciary, finance, and legislation.

3.2 The Autonomization of Bristol's Judicial System under the Charter of 1373

This charter marked a substantial expansion of Bristol's judicial autonomy. Most local civil and criminal matters within the city were thereafter heard by the mayor and sheriffs of Bristol rather than by external county authorities. In response to the needs of a commercial town, the city gradually developed a court system characterized by a clear division of functions and complementary jurisdictions.

The Mayor's Court, presided over by the mayor, primarily heard cases concerning trespass and fraud, while also providing notarial services for the registration of real property throughout Bristol (Sacks, 1985). It was the busiest court in the city and occupied a superior position within the urban judicial hierarchy. The County Court, administered by the sheriffs, met once each month and, in theory, possessed jurisdiction over a broader range of county affairs. The Staple Court was established following Bristol's recognition as a staple town and was likewise supervised by the mayor. It dealt mainly with written debt litigation related to the export trade in wool, leather, and other staple commodities. Although the Tolzey Court had existed for a considerable time, it was not formally mentioned until 1373. It offered a relatively rapid and inexpensive avenue for justice. Litigation was generally initiated through oral rather than written pleadings, and most litigants did not require legal representation. The court survived for so long because of its low costs, simplified procedures, and willingness to adapt to the practical needs of plaintiffs. Surviving records indicate that by the late fifteenth century it was handling more than five hundred cases annually (Rich, 1934). It also worked closely with the Piepowder Court, ensuring the swift resolution of commercial disputes (Veale, 1938). The presence of the mayor could be observed across all these courts. Acting as the "king's deputy," the mayor exercised extensive authority within the city. His power derived directly from royal authority and was not substantially constrained by either the common council or ecclesiastical institutions (Ricart, 2015).

Beyond civil cases, the mayor and sheriffs were empowered not only to hear a wide range of civil and commercial disputes, including cases involving land, debt, and contracts, but were also granted extensive criminal jurisdiction. They possessed the rights of "infangthief" and "outfangthief," namely the authority to arrest and try suspects accused of crimes committed both within and beyond the city's boundaries. All prisoners were detained in prisons constructed and administered by the city itself.

It was therefore evident that, after 1373, Bristol's judicial structure evolved into a self-governing system centered upon the authority of the mayor, while its diversified network of courts was designed to accommodate the practical demands of a commercial city.

3.3 Limited Autonomy under Central Restraint

In essence, the charter and the petitions that preceded it reflected a relationship of mutual dependence between the civic government and the Crown. By granting Bristol the status of a county borough, the monarchy provided the city's rulers with a clearly defined sphere of jurisdiction and governance. Moreover, upon the accession of each new King, Bristol customarily petitioned for the reissuance of its charter, seeking word-for-word confirmation of all privileges granted by previous monarchs. This mechanism ensured the continuity of local liberties while simultaneously demonstrating the Crown's trust in Bristol's capacity for self-government.

Although the 1373 charter appeared to free Bristol's urban courts from external jurisdiction and granted the city a high degree of autonomy, the Crown still retained a certain level of supervision and control. Bristol's courts remained subject to periodic oversight from the central government, and in cases involving serious crimes or particularly complex matters, the royal courts and itinerant justices could still intervene. The central courts at Westminster also retained the right to summon cases for review and correction, as well as to hear appeals from Bristol's courts (Sacks, 1985).

This system of restraint was also reflected in the Crown's control over the appointment of judicial officials. The final selection of the sheriff rested with the monarchy. Each year, the city nominated three candidates, from whom the Crown chose one to serve as sheriff, thereby ensuring royal influence over local judicial representatives. In addition, the oath-taking ceremonies of both the mayor and sheriffs were conducted under royal supervision. Furthermore, the Crown continued to exert significant influence over the port of Bristol through officials appointed by the monarchy, including royal customers, water bailiffs, controllers, surveyors, supervisors, gaugers, and searchers (Mills, 1947; Jones, 2012).

This demonstrated that the core mechanism of royal restraint lay in procedural supervision, periodic review, and cooperation in personnel appointments, ensuring that while the Crown granted urban self-government, judicial

authority did not become detached from central control. In this way, a balance of "autonomy with loyalty" was maintained.

In sum, the 1373 charter granted Bristol county status together with extensive judicial, administrative, and fiscal autonomy. At the same time, however, the Crown preserved effective control over the city by retaining ultimate appellate jurisdiction, supervising the appointment of officials, and requiring the payment of judicial revenues. This model of "embedded autonomy" reflected the distinctive political wisdom of governance in medieval England.

4. Mutual Benefits between the Crown and the City under the Charter of Judicial Autonomy

Amid the negotiations and power balancing between Bristol and the Crown, the Charter of 1373 emerged as a strategic compromise between the two sides. By granting extensive privileges, the monarchy secured the loyal financial and military support of this important economic center. In return, Bristol, while recognizing the Crown's supreme authority, obtained greater judicial efficiency and economic autonomy. This model of urban self-government ultimately produced mutual benefits for both parties, laying a foundation for local prosperity and the stability of the realm.

4.1 The Strengthening of Royal Power: Centralization, Revenue Expansion, and Military Support

Although the charter granted the city greater autonomy and elevated its political status, royal authority was not weakened as a result. On the contrary, the Crown strengthened the effectiveness of central rule in terms of national integration and institutional development, expanded its fiscal base and economic control, and at the same time secured greater military support.

First, Bristol's elevation to county status significantly reduced the Crown's administrative and judicial costs. Before 1373, the city was jointly governed by the sheriffs of Gloucestershire and Somerset, creating inefficient and fragmented administration. After the charter was granted, judicial authority became concentrated in the mayor, who presided over the city courts while also maintaining ties with the royal judicial system. This reform enabled the Crown to strengthen direct control over the city through loyal urban officials, while reducing administrative burdens and reinforcing central authority.

Second, the Crown also gained substantial economic benefits. Bristol paid 600 pounds to obtain the charter in 1373, a considerable sum at the time. The city's growing wealth was further demonstrated in 1397, when it provided the Crown with a loan of 800 pounds (Rich, 1934) and again in 1491, when Henry VII received a gift worth 1,800 pounds during his visit to Bristol (Fleming, 2013). Between 1377 and 1399, Bristol supplied roughly one quarter of all urban loans to the Crown in England, ranking second only to London among urban creditors. In addition, fines and amercements generated through judicial activities were required to be paid into the royal treasury (Harding, 1930).

Third, Bristol made a remarkable contribution to the royal fleet. Research by Liddy showed that between 1350 and 1370, Bristol provided 33 ships for royal service, compared to only 16 from York, while Bristol's vessels were generally larger in scale. From 1370 to 1400, the city supplied 163 ships to the Crown, averaging 5.4 ships annually, far exceeding its earlier average. The Bristol charter of 1378 also required citizens to construct small warships, known as balingers, as part of their military obligations. Throughout the late fourteenth century, Bristol's naval contribution exceeded that of York by more than two-thirds, making it one of the Crown's most important maritime centers outside London (Liddy, 2005).

In sum, the granting of urban charters created a mutually beneficial relationship between the Crown and the city. While Bristol gained greater autonomy, the monarchy secured sustained financial and military support and further strengthened central authority.

4.2 Urban Prosperity: Enhanced Autonomy, Stronger Leadership, and Improved Finances

After obtaining the charter, Bristol was better able to protect its own interests in economic and social affairs, meeting the practical needs of strengthening urban self-government, consolidating elite leadership, and improving municipal finances.

First, the city gained direct control over commercial and labor activities, which helped maintain economic interests and social order while promoting urban prosperity. For a commercial center, swift and efficient judicial decisions were essential. Bristol's citizens complained that the earlier cross-county judicial arrangement had caused the town's "decline in status and manifest impoverishment" (Harding, 1930). After 1373, disputes concerning debts, contracts,

and mortgages were judged according to local custom, protecting local merchants while greatly improving judicial efficiency.

Second, the charter strengthened the leadership of Bristol's urban elite. Its success depended heavily on a ruling group closely connected to the Crown. Prominent citizens such as Walter de Derby and John de Stoke provided the monarchy with financial and naval support and even participated in overseas diplomatic missions (Liddy, 1999). These connections gave Bristol access to influential court figures during the charter negotiations. The Crown, in turn, trusted local rulers to maintain law and order. Under the charter, the mayor, sheriffs, and their successors could select forty respected local men to deliberate and implement policies beneficial to the city, reflecting the central role of urban elites in civic governance and development.

Third, fiscal resources formed the foundation of Bristol's prosperity. In 1373, the citizens petitioned not against royal taxation itself, but for the legal right of the local government to collect and manage revenues through the charter. The Crown ultimately accepted this demand, allowing judicial profits and court revenues to remain under municipal control for public works and defense. This not only provided significant financial resources, but also safeguarded the independence of the city's finances.

In sum, the Bristol charter of 1373 demonstrates that urban prosperity rested upon the combined forces of autonomy, effective leadership, and fiscal capacity. Together, these factors drove the city's rise and long-term development.

4.3 Dependence and Balance: Reconsidering Medieval Central-Local Relations

In 1373, Edward III granted Bristol a royal charter that elevated it to the status of a county corporate, making it the first city outside London to receive such recognition. This decision reflected the Crown's strategic regard for Bristol and marked an important turning point in the development of local self-government in medieval England. The charter not only confirmed Bristol's administrative, judicial, and economic privileges, but also revealed the complex balance of power between the monarchy and urban communities. Rather than representing either a unilateral royal concession or a complete victory for local autonomy, the charter established a relationship of "mutual dependence and dynamic balance" between the center and the locality. It demonstrated both the Crown's reliance on urban resources and the city's dependence on royal authority, while institutional mechanisms ensured mutual restraint.

The relationship between the Crown and Bristol was fundamentally reciprocal. From the royal perspective, the monarchy depended on Bristol's economic value as a major commercial port. In the late Middle Ages, Bristol maintained active trade connections with Ireland, Wales, and the Mediterranean. In 1373, Edward III was also facing severe financial pressure from the Anglo-French wars, while John of Gaunt's campaigns had further drained the royal treasury (Little, 1954). Under such circumstances, the Crown had strong incentives to accept Bristol's offer of financial support in exchange for county status. By granting greater judicial privileges and elevating the city's political standing, the monarchy secured Bristol's loyalty and cooperation. From the city's perspective, however, autonomy still relied upon royal authorization. The charter granted Bristol the right to elect its own sheriffs and a mayor who also served as escheator, while exempting citizens from attending external courts. Judicial autonomy also allowed the city to retain substantial profits generated through court activity. Thus, the relationship was not one-sided: the Crown gained resources and loyalty, while the city strengthened its internal governance and autonomy.

At the same time, royal checks upon urban autonomy remained significant. First, the terms and payments required for obtaining liberties and judicial privileges were ultimately determined by the king. When disputes arose over financial arrangements, the Crown could appoint royal officials to take over elements of urban administration, including markets and courts, pressuring the townsmen into accepting royal conditions. Moreover, urban privileges were never irreversible, as the King retained the authority to revoke them in exceptional circumstances (Barron, 1971; Frost, 2004). Second, although the charter granted Bristol broad judicial powers, the Crown still reserved final jurisdiction over major cases and maintained oversight through itinerant justices and supervisory commissions. These mechanisms ensured that local justice remained within the broader framework of the common law system.

In sum, the Charter of 1373 carried major implications for medieval governance. Through the grant of privileges, the Crown strengthened central authority and secured broader fiscal and military support, while Bristol gained judicial efficiency, economic autonomy, and greater political influence in return for recognizing royal supremacy. The charter thus embodied a model of "dynamic balance and mutual benefit" between the center and the locality. It later served as a precedent for cities such as York and Norwich in seeking similar county status, while also offering insight into the political structure of late medieval England.

5. Conclusion

Judicial autonomy in late medieval Bristol represented a highly coordinated form of governance shaped by practical interests and institutional negotiation between the Crown and the city. The Charter of 1373 marked a turning point in this process. It not only resolved the jurisdictional difficulties caused by Bristol's divided geographical administration, but also established a judicial system centered on the mayor and supported by multiple courts through the city's elevation to county status. This transformation reflected both Bristol's continuing financial and military value to the monarchy and the Crown's pragmatic response to local governing needs during the process of royal centralization.

Bristol's judicial autonomy was not a form of complete independence, but rather a "limited autonomy" exercised within the framework of royal authority. The Crown retained overarching control through mechanisms such as final rights of appeal, supervision over official appointments, and oversight of itinerant justices. At the same time, the city effectively exercised civil and criminal jurisdiction within the limits defined by the charter, improving the efficiency of commercial dispute settlement and the maintenance of social order. This model of "embedded autonomy" both strengthened urban governance and reinforced royal influence at the local level.

In sum, Bristol's judicial transformation was not only the result of the city's own institutional development, but also a reflection of the evolving relationship between central and local authority in the broader process of state formation in medieval England. It demonstrated the adaptability and diversity of urban self-government under an increasingly centralized monarchy, while also revealing how the Crown used legal authorization and institutional checks to maintain political unity. As such, Bristol provided a valuable case for understanding urban governance and the structure of the late medieval English polity.

Funding

The research is funded by the 2026 Tianjin Research Innovation Project for Postgraduate Students, "Research on Grassroots Governance in Late Medieval London" (No. 2026KYCX016Z).

References

Angelucci, C., Meraglia, S., & Voigtländer, N. (2022). How merchant towns shaped parliaments: From the Norman conquest of England to the Great Reform Act. *American Economic Review*, *112*(10), 3441-3487. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20200885

Barron, C. M. (1971). Richard II's quarrel with London. In F. R. H. DuBoulay & C. M. Barron (Eds.), *The reign of Richard II: Essays in honour of May McKisack* (pp. 173-201). Athlone Press.

Bevan, K. (2013). Clerks and scriveners: Legal literacy and access to justice in late medieval England [Doctoral dissertation, University of Exeter].

Bickley, F. B. (1900). *The little red book of Bristol* (Vol. 2, p. 115). W. Crofton Hemmons.

Cronne, H. A. (1946). *Bristol charters 1378-1499* (pp. 28, 31-40, 87). J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd.

Cuenca, E. L. (2019). Town clerks and the authorship of custumals in medieval England. *Urban History*, *46*(2). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926818000287

De Ruysscher, D., et al. (2023). Urban constitutionalism and the rule of law: Historical perspectives and contemporary challenges. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, *15*(2-3), 183-198. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40803-023-00192-2

Dobson, R. B. (1977). Urban decline in late medieval England. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, *27*. https://doi.org/10.2307/3679185

Fleming, P. (2000). Conflict and urban government in later medieval England: St Augustine's Abbey and Bristol. *Urban History*, *27*(3). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926800000316

Fleming, P. (2013). *Time, space and power in later medieval Bristol* (pp. 7, 221). Yorkist History Trust.

Frost, R. H. (2004). The urban elite. In C. Rawcliffe & R. Wilson (Eds.), *Medieval Norwich* (pp. 246-249). Hambledon and London.

Goddard, R., & Phipps, T. (Eds.). (2019). *Town courts and urban society in late medieval England, 1250-1500*. Boydell Press.

Godwin, J. (2015). *The origins of Bristol's mayoralty*. Bristol & Gloucestershire Archaeological Society.

Hambleton, R., Sweeting, D. W. J., & Thom, O. (2022). Place, power and leadership: Insights from mayoral governance and leadership innovation in Bristol, UK. *Leadership*, *18*(1), 81-101. https://doi.org/10.1177/17427150211028122

Harding, N. D. (1930). *Bristol charters 1155-1373* (pp. 45, 67, 87, 92, 95, 118-173). J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd.

Hartrich, E. (2017). Charters and inter-urban networks: England, 1439-1449. *English Historical Review*, *132*(155). https://doi.org/10.1093/ehr/cex136

Hunt, W. (1898). *Bristol* (p. 1). Longmans, Green and Co.

Jones, E. T. (2012). *Inside the illicit economy: Reconstructing the smugglers' trade of sixteenth-century Bristol* (pp. 37-41). Ashgate.

Latimer, J. (Ed.). (1909). *Calendar of the charters of the city and county of Bristol* (p. 67). Bristol City Council.

Lee, J. (2007). "Ye shall disturbe noe mans right": Oath-taking and oath-breaking in late medieval and early modern Bristol. *Urban History*, *34*(1). https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926807004312

Liddy, C. D. (1999). *Urban communities and the crown: Relations between Bristol, York, and the royal government, 1350-1400* (pp. 202, 216-217) [Doctoral dissertation, University of York].

Liddy, C. D. (2005). *War, politics and finance in late medieval English towns: Bristol, York and the crown, 1350-1400* (pp. 19-43, 52-57). Royal Historical Society.

Little, B. (1954). *The city and county of Bristol: A study in Atlantic civilization* (pp. 1-2, 72). Warner Laurie Limited.

Lyes, J. (2006). *Bristol's courts of law*. Bristol Historical Association.

Mills, M. H. (1947). The collectors of customs. In W. A. Morris & J. R. Strayer (Eds.), *The English government at work, 1327-1336: Volume II: Fiscal administration* (pp. 168-181). Medieval Academy of America.

Nicolson, G. H. (1970). The medieval wills of Bristol [Master's thesis, University of Birmingham].

Pounds, N. (2005). *The medieval city*. Greenwood Press. https://doi.org/10.5040/9798400684463

Ricart, R. (2015). *The maire of Bristowe is calendar* (P. Fleming, Ed.). Bristol Record Society.

Rich, E. E. (1934). *The staple court books of Bristol* (p. 74). J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd.

Sacks, D. H. (1985). *Trade, society and politics in Bristol, 1500-1640* (Vol. 1, pp. 1, 28-29, 47, 62, 78, 166-168, 182). Garland Publishing.

Sharp, E. (2025). Community-led management of the (urban) commons: Lessons from the Narroways Nature Reserve, Bristol. *Local Environment*, *30*(2), 189-206. https://doi.org/10.1080/13549839.2024.2419600

Sherborne, J. W. (1965). *The port of Bristol in the Middle Ages*. Bristol Historical Association.

Sherborne, J. W. (1969). The battle of La Rochelle and the war at sea, 1372-5. *Historical Research*, *42*(105). https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2281.1969.tb02322.x

Sherborne, J. W. (1971). *The port of Bristol in the Middle Ages* (pp. 8-10). Bristol Branch of the Historical Association.

Veale, E. W. W. (1938). *The great red book of Bristol: Text, part II* (pp. 55, 66). J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd.

Winter, M. (2024). Public services and the urban middling sort: The provision of water in Bristol, Chester and Ipswich, 1540-1640. *Urban History*, *51*(3), 500-518. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963926823000470