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Thomas Juxon (1614–72)

Thomas Juxon was born on 24 June 1614 and baptised in his father's London parish of St Stephen Walbrook on 30 June. He was the second son of John Juxon, a citizen of London free of the merchant taylors, who earned a lucrative living as a sugar baker/refiner. John was of genteel lineage, the son of Raph Juxon of Christ Church, Newgate, by Sara Hawkins, daughter of John Hawkins of Rugby, Warwickshire, and a cousin of William Juxon, the future bishop of London and archbishop of Canterbury. Thomas's mother was Elizabeth Kirrell, the daughter of John Kirrell of St Michael Queenhithe and East Sheen in the Surrey parish of Mortlake. Both parents died during Thomas's childhood, his mother in November 1619 and his father in August 1626, and were buried in St Lawrence Pountney.

Juxon attended Merchant Taylors' School in 1619–21 at the remarkably young years of five to seven, from shortly after his mother's death until his father's remarriage in 1621. Arthur Juxon, John Juxon's youngest brother, acted as guardian for the young family, after the latter's death, arranging for Thomas to be bound apprentice to William Allott, a liveryman of the merchant taylors' company, for nine years on 29 November 1630 on a bond of £100. However, Thomas eventually gained his freedom of the merchant taylors by patrimony rather than...
service on 25 October 1637. His initial schooling and continuing education during his apprenticeship, as the journal testifies, produced a soundly educated, literate and informed individual with some knowledge of Latin and French, the classics and history, and an intellectual curiosity ready to feed on the great array of published news, information and controversy during the unprecedented press freedom of the early 1640s.

Thomas was born into, and enjoyed the benefits of, a family of rising prosperity and influential social connections, and his own career was to build upon that success. His father acquired the Surrey manor of East Sheen and Westhall in 1619, and subsequently divided his time between residing in his new home, set among orchards and gardens in the parish of Mortlake, and managing his sugarhouse in Walbrook. The move to East Sheen, and his second marriage on 18 December 1621 to Judith Lawrence, née Rainton, the daughter of Alderman Nicholas Rainton, confirmed that John Juxon had arrived socially. His 1626 will was that of a prosperous tradesman, with considerable property accumulated in Mortlake and London, stock in the East India Company, and jewels, plate and other furnishings of an affluent household. Among his bequests were an addition to the merchant taylors' plate, sums for several 'godly ministers' and towards the maintenance of lectures in seven London parishes, provision for four poor widows in Mortlake (who were to wear gowns embroidered with his initials) and other charitable bequests. Funer al arrangements included mourning cloth for Alderman Rainton and his wife and other prominent relatives, a dinner for fellow liverymen of the merchant taylors, and an attendance of the company's almsmen and boys from Christ's Hospital. Most of the property in Mortlake was bequeathed to the eldest son, John Juxon junior, who later married Susan Langham, the daughter of George Langham, a London merchant. Good City connections for the Juxons were also cemented by the 1627 marriage of Thomas's elder sister, Elizabeth, to Maurice Gethin, an affluent woollen draper. Thomas was given the brick house recently built by his father in East Sheen and approximately a hundred acres of surrounding property.

---

8 Presentment books of the merchant taylors' company (MF 324/28), vol. 2, unfol.: 25 October 1637.
9 VCH, Surrey, iv. 71; below, appendices, pp. 178, 180–82.
10 Boyd 3726. Nicholas Rainton served as sheriff in 1621–22, lord mayor in 1632–33 and was knighted on 5 May 1633: Beaven, ii. 55.
11 George Langham was alderman's deputy for the ward of Vintry in 1634 and a City militia captain: Boyd 35379; Visitation, 1633–35, ii. 45 where John Juxon is mistakenly called John Jackson of Mortlake.
12 International Genealogical Index, London, St Augustine Watling Street, marriages 27 November 1627; Woodhead, p. 76; Lindley, p. 206 & n. 35.
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After the completion of his apprenticeship, Thomas entered into partnership with his half-uncle, Matthew Sheppard – another wealthy sugar baker residing in the London parish of St Thomas the Apostle but also possessing property at Mortlake. Within a few years Thomas was beginning his rise to respectable positions in the civic arena. By 1642 he was serving as colonel’s ensign in the green regiment of the City trained bands commanded by Alderman John Warner; he had become a captain in that regiment by 1643 and major and lieutenant-colonel in 1647. He was also admitted to the livery of the merchant tailors on 8 July 1646. Yet there is no evidence that he ever became a common councillor, despite his intimate knowledge of that assembly’s internal politics, although his uncle and former guardian, Arthur Juxon, was one of the councillors for Walbrook and may have been at least one channel of information.

Thomas’s marriage on 2 March 1647 at St Giles-in-the-Fields to his first wife Elizabeth Carent, the daughter of Maurice Carent of Toomer Park, Somerset, esquire, put the final seal on his social respectability. The Carents were an old established county family and Elizabeth’s mother was the eldest daughter of Sir James Ley, first Lord Ley and earl of Marlborough, who had served as lord treasurer in 1624–28. The marriage produced two children, Elizabeth and William, baptised on 6 December 1647 and 14 October 1649 respectively at St Thomas the Apostle. According to the terms of a settlement made by Maurice Carent, these children and their heirs were to inherit the lands of Toomer and other property should his son and heir, James Carent, die without children.

Thomas was sufficiently proud of his late wife’s ancestry (she died in September 1669) to leave bequests in his 1672 will for the erection of a
funeral monument to her parents in their parish church, and a marble plaque on the wall of St Mary Islington near the spot where his wife was buried, recounting her lineage and displaying his own coat of arms alongside that of the Carents'. The marriage had also brought Thomas into close social contact with the Somerset MP John Harington, who was related to the Carents through marriage and came to refer to Thomas as 'cousin Juxon' after the latter's marriage to Elizabeth Carent. Within a year or so of his first wife's death, and shortly before his own, Juxon was to remarry. His second wife was Elizabeth Meredith, the daughter of the late Sir Robert Meredith of Greenhills, county Kildare, who had been a leading member of the new wave of pre-1641 English Protestants settlers in Ireland. Sir Robert had been a member of the Irish privy council and had served as chancellor of the exchequer from the 1630s until his death in October 1668. He had also been a member of several important committees concerned with Irish lands or revenues in the 1650s. The marriage brought Juxon into close acquaintance with another leading settler family, the Cootes. His new wife's sister, Alice, had married Charles Coote, the second earl of Mountrath, in 1653.

The 1642 scheme to finance the reconquest of Ireland through the Irish adventurers drew initial investments from Thomas, his elder brother John, and his uncle Arthur Juxon, who had previously been engaged in trade with Dublin. Thomas subsequently became a substantial investor in Irish land, acquiring 3,491 acres (for subscriptions to the Irish adventurers totalling £2,145) in Meath and Queen's counties, Leinster. During the 1650s he purchased Irish land from other original investors to consolidate his holdings, and by the time of his death could refer in addition...

19 Boyd 35385; below, appendices, pp. 189–90. Unfortunately, there is no surviving plaque to examine in St Mary Islington as the church was destroyed by bombing during the second world war.

20 M. F. Stieg (ed.), The diary of John Harington, MP, 1645–53 (Somerset Record Soc. 74, 1977), pp. 28–9, 32, 34, 46, 61, 68.


22 Burke, Peerage and baronetage (1967), p. 597. Juxon's will also refers to a loan made by him of £1,000 on statute staple to Colonel Thomas Coote, the brother of Sir Charles Coote, the first earl of Mountrath. Thomas Coote died without issue on 25 November 1671 (below, p. 189). Like Juxon, the Merediths and Cootes held lands in Meath and Queen's counties.


24 Bottigheimer, pp. 185, 205.

to his ‘castles, houses and lands’ in county Limerick. This accumulation of Irish property took him over to Ireland where he could enjoy the status of being one of the kingdom’s new generation of English landowners, and his second marriage was to signal his social arrival. He was living in Dublin around the time of the Restoration when he was a key figure among Irish adventurers anxious to retain possession of the lands they had acquired under the scheme in what became the act of settlement of 1662. Apart from his Irish interests, Thomas had also temporarily benefited from the sale of dean and chapter lands. Acting jointly with another, on 21 March 1650 he had purchased the manor and prebend of East Marden, Sussex, for the sum of £1,312 10s. There is also the possibility that his sugar interests had developed in the late 1650s to include direct involvement in trade with Barbados. Clearly Thomas Juxon was a man who had prospered in life. Yet he was to be reminded of his childhood experience of the precariousness of human existence by the mental illness of his only son, who was unable to reap the material rewards of that prosperity. Thomas’s death was followed by an apparent legal wrangle over the terms of his will which pitted Elizabeth Juxon, his daughter and executrix, against his nephews, Thomas and George Juxon, the two surviving sons of his elder brother, John. Final judgement went in Elizabeth’s favour.

So far as Thomas’s religious background and convictions were concerned, he was born into a godly family and remained at the heart of the godly network in London in the 1640s. His mother was a woman of exceptional piety if the author of her funeral sermon is to be believed.
In his 1626 will, Thomas's father left bequests for mourning gowns for eleven 'godly ministers' to accompany his corpse at the funeral. The ministers included two celebrated preachers, the extremely influential Richard Sibbes and Nathaniel Culverwell, the curate of St Lawrence Pountney, Elias Crabtree, the vicar of Mortlake, one of the preachers at St Antholin's, and his brother, Rowland Juxon. John Juxon also left bequests for the maintenance of lectures in seven London parishes and made provision for one of his nephews to be placed an apprentice with 'some honest religious tradesman'. John Juxon junior (Thomas's elder brother) was to die 'in the faith of the gospel' of wounds sustained in the first battle of Newbury in October 1643. In his will, John urged his brothers and sisters that 'they would Christianly, and carefully see to the godly, and religious educating' of his children after his death and he asked that the Presbyterian Lazarus Seaman would preach at his funeral. Thomas's uncle and guardian, Arthur Juxon, was to become a follower of the Independent divine Thomas Brooks, who was to preach his funeral sermon in 1652.

Thomas Juxon's own will, made in June 1672, contains few clues as to his religious leanings apart from a fairly conventional godly preamble and an emphasis on the doctrine of the Trinity. The only clergy to receive bequests were two Dublin parsons. No provision was made for aiding nonconformist clergy or laity, and no minister was named to preach the funeral sermon. He has all the appearance of a godly yet conforming
member of his parish church, and his more radical past is effectively hidden from view.

That past is first visible in June 1641, when he was numbered among the parish zealots of St Thomas the Apostle, one of the first London congregations to forcibly remove their Laudian altar rails.\textsuperscript{36} The journal itself provides further, and much more extensive, evidence concerning Thomas's religious beliefs. One prominent religious theme running through the journal is the repeated statement of a belief in a providential God who intervenes in the affairs of man and moulds events according to His divine will. Thomas's Erastianism is equally clear: he writes approvingly of parliament's determination to resist clerical pretensions and keep ultimate control over religious matters in its own hands, and depicts London's Presbyterian clergy as schemers and initiators of political action to serve their own ends. Presbyterianism on the Scottish model is unacceptable to him, and he sees parliament and its privileges under threat if ever the Presbyterians managed to establish a general assembly on Scottish lines. Yet he was content to have his Presbyterian brother-in-law, Richard Byfield, officiate at his wedding in March 1647, and there is a possibility that he was one of the ruling elders chosen in the third classis in October 1649.\textsuperscript{37} His attitude to Independency is a mixed one. He recognises the injustice of Independents facing banishment, following the imposition of a coercive Presbyterian church, when they had been so active in defence of liberty, and the only clergyman to be singled out for any praise in the journal is the Independent preacher, Jeremiah Burroughs, whose death is 'much lamented'.\textsuperscript{38} On the other hand, Thomas is totally opposed to a legal recognition of religious toleration as opening the floodgates to religious anarchy.\textsuperscript{39} Like a number of other prominent godly Londoners, his preferred religious settlement was most probably one in which the parish structure of the church was maintained, ultimate authority in ecclesiastical affairs rested with parliament, and gathered churches were

\textsuperscript{36} Lindley, pp. 39–40, 68–9.

\textsuperscript{37} Below, pp. 49, 50, 58, 61, 70, 72, 74–5, 80, 85, 86, 87, 88–90, 94–5, 97, 99, 106, 107–8, 112, 115, 121, 128, 134, 138, 145, 150. A 'Juxon' without a forename is recorded as one of the ruling elders chosen on 30 October 1649 for the third classis in the records of the London provincial assembly: Lambeth Palace Library, Sion College Mss., I 40.2/E 17, records of the provincial assembly 3 May 1647 – 15 August 1660, fo. 101v. However, Thomas Juxon's parish of St Thomas the Apostle (where his son William was baptised on 14 October 1649) was located in the second classis: Firth and Rait, i. 750. It is more likely, therefore, that the Juxon referred to is Thomas's uncle, Arthur Juxon of St Stephen Walbrook in the third classis, despite the fact that he was apparently a religious Independent: above p. 6 & n. 34.

\textsuperscript{38} Below, pp. 86, 140. He may also have come under the influence of Thomas Brooks when he preached in St Thomas the Apostle, possibly through his uncle Arthur, but this is purely conjectural.

\textsuperscript{39} Below, pp. 95–6.
 accorded a pragmatic toleration. Again, like other Londoners, he too probably regretted the divisions in the ranks of the godly, and numbered among his close relations and friends both Presbyterians and Independents.40

There is much clearer evidence about his political beliefs in the 1640s. Both Thomas and his elder brother, John, were dedicated parliamentarians. Thomas and his business partner, Matthew Sheppard, were two of the assessors for parliamentarian levies in the ward of Vintry in December 1642, and Thomas himself was still contributing towards the support of the City’s forces in April 1646.41 All three men also experienced direct military action as officers in the first battle of Newbury. Thomas Juxon and Matthew Sheppard were captains in the green regiment under the command of Colonel John Warner, while John Juxon served as captain in Colonel Edmund Harvey’s London regiment of horse. John was mortally wounded at Newbury, and died within a few days of being carried to London, and Thomas himself may also have been less seriously wounded in the same battle.42 A royalist commentator on the London militia officers at Newbury described Thomas as ‘a sugar baker living in St Thomas Apostle, a most violent ass’, yet he himself had proudly adopted as his motto around this time ‘Probus invider nemini’ (Upright, envier of no one).43

It was not long after returning with his dying brother from Newbury that Thomas began work on his journal, in the course of which he provides valuable insights into his own political outlook. At an early stage in the journal he makes clear that he has a deep-seated antipathy to kings and lords in general, and to King Charles and the current peerage in particular, while stopping short of a principled advocacy of

40 Lindley, pp. 278–9. Thomas Juxon’s family connections, for example, included Presbyterians such as Richard Byfield and Maurice Gethin, a leading City Independent, Daniel Taylor, and the former Presbyterian turned Independent, Colonel Edmund Harvey: Lindley, pp. 70, 311; Greaves and Zaller, iii. 226–7; PRO, PROB 11/295/206 will of John Juxon. Daniel Williams was also apparently on intimate terms with Juxon and was to subsequently marry his widow: DNB, xxi. 387.

41 PRO, SP19/1/42; CLRO, militia accounts: money lent for the support of City forces, accounts c.1643–1647/8, book 3, fo. 18. Thomas lent £26 13 4.

42 BL, Harl. Ms. 986, fos. 19, 21; H. A. Dillon (ed.), ‘On a Ms. list of officers of the London trained bands in 1643’, Archaeologia 3 (1896), p. 198. Captain John Juxon died in the Allhallows, Bread Street, home of his brother-in-law, Maurice Gethin, where he had been nursed during his last days by his sister, Mrs Elizabeth Gethin. Thomas Juxon was also at his dying brother’s side. John was buried in St Lawrence Pountney near his late parents on 16 October 1643 after a hero’s funeral, with military honours provided by Colonel Harvey and his horse regiment: Lambeth Palace Library, VH 96/1508, will of John Juxon; Guild., Ms. 7670, fo. 119v; H. B. Wilson, A history of the parish of St Lawrence Pountney, London (1831), pp. 135–6; Burn, Registrum ecclesiae parochialis, p. 107.

43 BL, Harl. Ms. 986, fo. 19; ibid., Sloane Ms. 2035B, fo. 27.
Commenting on the prince of Orange’s ‘designs towards sovereignty’, Juxon decried against ‘the great danger and snare in giving so much power and so absolute into one hand; withal that ’tis not safe to let the same man long in that charge, much less suffer it to be hereditary’. Charles himself is portrayed as a scheming and devious king (‘no prince ever used more dissimulation’) who would stop at nothing to achieve his ends, and who was intent on complete victory while outwardly pretending to work for a negotiated settlement. There is also an expression of moral antipathy to the queen’s court in London as having been ‘the greatest bawdy house in England’. Juxon is equally scathing about the peerage, which is seen as enjoying a strong bond of common self-interest with the king. On the other hand, he is most certainly not an advocate of a wider social dispersal of political rights. He deplores ‘the unhappiness of a popularity, where things are transacted by multitudes, who are men taken out of them [sic] lump’. For him, the House of Commons was the representative body of the nation to which obedience is due by all, and he probably shared the sentiments he attributed to Cromwell about the need to submit to parliament and that ‘The common people never were fit for government’.

Although traditionally described as a political Independent, Juxon’s political attitudes, like his religious convictions, are much more complex than such a simple party label would imply. He was certainly in favour of the 1644 campaign to reform Essex’s army, describing the two radical activists from Westminster who were committed by the Lords for a verbal attack on that army as ‘both gallant men’. Two years later, he resolutely defended the political Independents in the Commons against the charge that they were opposed to peace and sound government: ‘none drive less particular interests than they nor have served them everywhere more faithfully’. At one point in the journal Juxon also writes as if he were personally acquainted with three of the leaders of political Independency, Vane, Wharton and St John. Two Independent party leaders on common council, Colonel Thomas Player and Stephen Estwicke, are defended against the charge that they were religious Independents when they were ‘only honest and ingenious men’.

44 Below, pp. 29–32.
45 Below, p. 92.
46 Below, pp. 73, 98, 133, 144. This is a view of Charles I largely confirmed by recent research.
47 Below, p. 93.
48 Below, pp. 47, 68, 72.
49 Below, pp. 102, 157–8.
50 Below, p. 51.
51 Below, p. 103.
52 Below, p. 94.
53 Below, p. 103.
despite this evidence of Independent political sympathies, Juxon never
toed a rigid party line, for this would have run counter to both his
convictions and his temperament. He provides a dispassionate analysis
of the London mayoral election of 1646 in which the Independent
candidate, John Warner, was defeated and the neo-royalist Sir John
Gayre was chosen. In the circumstances, Juxon welcomed the result as
avoiding a significant increase in party animosity between Independents
and Presbyterians, and giving both parties an object lesson in the need
to establish ‘love and amity’ between them.54 But it is his remarks about
the Presbyterian party leader, Sir Philip Stapilton, on the last page of
his journal (‘Thus died that brave and valiant wise Stapilton, to the
grief of all his friends and his enemies too’)55 that finally confirms that
Juxon was far from being locked into party loyalties.

By this stage, Juxon was one of the senior officers in the green
regiment approved of by the Presbyterian London militia committee
established in May 1647. His half-uncle and former partner, Matthew
Sheppard, was colonel of that regiment and his lieutenant-colonel was
the Presbyterian activist, John Lane.56 Yet in the purge of militia officers
following the army’s march into London in August 1647, Juxon replaced
Lane as the regiment’s lieutenant-colonel under the leading City
Independent, Owen Rowe, as colonel. A Presbyterian account of these
purges bemoaned the fact that they ‘have turned out the discreet and
faithful Colonel Sheppard, and put in the Bull Rowe, as also honest
and stout Lieutenant-Colonel Lane, and put that swearing phantastic
fool Juxon in his place. I suppose the rest of the commanders of that
regiment will not be commanded by a knave and a fool.’57 Thus in
spite of the fact that Juxon was not a rigid supporter of any party, he
undoubtedly aroused exceptionally strong feelings of animosity in some
of his political opponents – from the royalist dismissal of him as ‘a
most violent ass’ to the Presbyterian denunciation of him as ‘that
swearing phantastic fool’.

Unfortunately, the journal ends with the army’s march into London
and the flight of the eleven members, and there is no surviving record
of Juxon’s attitude to, or possible role in, the subsequent events leading
up to the king’s trial and execution and the political revolution of
1648–49. His judgement on events may have been characteristically
ambivalent: approving of the end of monarchy and the House of Lords
but opposed to the army’s intervention into the political arena to bring

54 Below, p. 137.
55 Below, p. 169.
57 Nagel, appendix 5, p. 319; Lindley, p. 388; A pair of spectacles for the City (4 Dec 1647),
BL, E419/9, p. 9.
this about. Perhaps his belief in a providential God led him to share with other godly contemporaries a heightened belief in millenarianism. He would almost certainly have had little time for the Levellers and their ideas on religious and political freedom. Making one brief and final appearance on the English political stage in 1659, Juxon was elected MP for Helston, Cornwall, in Richard Cromwell's parliament. However, his parliamentary career appears to have been fairly non-descript.\textsuperscript{58} At the Restoration, he became a leading figure among Irish adventurers seeking secure titles to the lands they had acquired in Ireland, and was resident in Dublin for a time busily engaged in that project.\textsuperscript{59} However, he was back in London in 1669, if not sooner, when he was admitted to the court of assistants of the merchant tailors' company, and remained active in its deliberations until the spring of 1672.\textsuperscript{60} By the latter date, he had remarried and he subsequently returned to Ireland to set up a new household with his second wife in Dublin.\textsuperscript{61} Juxon died on 2 October 1672, and was buried on 14 October in St James's church, Dublin.\textsuperscript{62}

The journal's provenance

Juxon’s journal is deposited in Dr Williams’s Library, 14 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0AG. The document measures five inches by seven inches, contains 121 folios and is bound in vellum covers which are worn and damaged, especially along the spine, and the edges of some of the enclosed pages are slightly frayed. The journal came into the library’s possession on 25 March 1850 when the Rev. George Kenrick

\textsuperscript{58} C 219/46/11; C7, vii. 595, 600, 609, 622–3, 634, 637, 711–12; J. T. Rutt (ed.), Diary of Thomas Burton (4 vols., 1828), iii. 560; iv. 211.

\textsuperscript{59} CSPD Ireland, 1660–62, pp. 101, 337. His 1672 will suggests he had been a resident of Dublin for some time. There is a reference to plate and other goods in Dublin; bequests were made to two Dublin parsons; his son William had been left there to be cured of his ‘melancholy distemper’; and an earlier will made by Thomas Juxon had been lodged with an official of the exchequer in Dublin: below, appendices, pp. 188–91.

\textsuperscript{60} He was elected fourth warden of the merchant tailors on 30 July 1669; was sworn a warden’s substitute and an assistant of the company on 6 August 1669; was elected head or master warden on 12 July 1670; and was attending meetings of the court of assistants in April 1672: Guild., court minute books of the merchant tailors’ company, vol. 10, pp. 245, 248, 321, 445–7.

\textsuperscript{61} His will refers to a bequest to his new wife of all his plate and goods in Dublin ‘and going thither’, indicating that a move of household was in progress at the time the will was made: below, appendices, p. 189.

\textsuperscript{62} National Library of Ireland (Genealogical Office), funeral entries, vol. 4, Ms. 67, fo. 178; ibid., vo. 11, Ms. 74, fo. 8. The design of Juxon’s shield is laid out in the first entry. His widow was to marry Daniel Williams in 1675: DNB, xxi. 387.