



1-1-2002

Hunting for Breakfast in Medieval and Early Modern Europe

Ken Albala

University of the Pacific, kalbala@pacific.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/cop-facbooks>

 Part of the [Food Security Commons](#), [History Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Albala, K. (2002). Hunting for Breakfast in Medieval and Early Modern Europe. In Harlan Walker (Eds.), *The Meal* (20–30). Totnes, Devon, England: Oxford Symposium/Prospect
<https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/cop-facbooks/35>

This Contribution to Book is brought to you for free and open access by the All Faculty Scholarship at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of the Pacific Faculty Books and Book Chapters by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

Hunting for Breakfast in Medieval and Early Modern Europe

Ken Albala

There is probably no meal more neglected, maligned and conspicuously skipped than breakfast. Cookbook authors scarcely mention breakfast foods, descriptions of food customs usually fail to discuss breakfast, and many languages do not even have a decent word for it. The Italian *prima colazione* to distinguish it from a proper collation or light snack and French *petit déjeuner* reveal that this whole meal is anomalous. The German *Frühstück* (early morsel) is hardly more convincing. Moreover, in the historical record, evidence of breakfast before the eighteenth century is fleeting. It appears to have been a meal taken on an irregular basis, by invalids or the very young. Sometimes we catch glimpses of labourers and vague concessions to their need for an early morning boost, but for literate Europeans the entire meal seems to have been an embarrassment or nonexistent. Even where we know breakfast was an established custom, there is scant written evidence of anyone actually eating it.

This may have been partly a consequence of current medical opinion which consistently forbade breakfast to normal healthy adults. Taken at face value, we might assume that there was no such meal. The comments of physicians and food writers, however, suggest that breakfast was a regular meal for the majority of labouring people, especially in England and northern Europe. Even in the south, although evidence is less persuasive, breakfast did exist in some form, despite the admonitions of medical orthodoxy.

We do know, as did medieval and early modern Europeans, that the Romans regularly enjoyed breakfast or *ientaculum* which usually consisted of leftovers from the night before: bread and cheese, olives, eggs and honey. Breakfast was also sold by bakers, as Martial tells us. *Surgite: iam vendit pueris ientacula pistor* (Rise: the baker is already selling breakfast to the boys).¹ The meal was probably a natural development of postponing the two larger meals, *prandium* and *coenum*, to later in the day. In fact, the three-meal structure of ancient Rome was roughly similar to the modern American pattern, with an

added *merenda* or snack around 5 p.m., and the largest meal of the day some time in the evening.

Breakfast seems to have disappeared among the Germanic tribes who displaced the Romans, probably because they customarily ate two meals and the larger of the two was in the morning. These were the ancestors of 'dinner' and 'supper' as taken throughout the medieval and early modern periods in Europe. The tendency, however, was for these two meals to be consistently pushed later and later in the day. The Normans apparently ate dinner around 9 a.m. and throughout the centuries we find dinner moved, until it rests at 11 a.m. in the Tudor period and 1 p.m. or much later by the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Naturally this is when breakfast makes its grand re-entrance, and the image we have of bloated businessmen stuffing their furry cheeks with beefsteaks and oysters first thing in the morning is at least accurate for the wealthiest of Europeans. The 'traditional' British and American breakfast was a natural consequence of moving the other meals to later in the day.

But what of the centuries between the high points of Augustan Rome and nineteenth-century Britain? Did breakfast really exist, or is it lurking somewhere beneath the dazzling contemporary accounts of banquets and grand dining that so preoccupy culinary historians? This paper will attempt to ferret out this elusive meal by seeing what physicians and food writers of the past had to say about it. It may be that their generally negative attitude toward breakfast has helped to obscure the historical record, even if it did not prevent many people from eating it.

The word from which many European languages derive the word for breakfast was the late Latin *disjejunere* or *disjunare* in vulgar Latin (to un-fast). Strangely enough, the word was contracted by the eleventh century to *dîner* in Old French, and so the word for dinner actually means breakfast. This makes perfect sense, because as the first meal, dinner did break the fast. But existence of this word then tells us nothing about the meal we now call breakfast, eaten first thing in the morning.

The first recorded use of the word breakfast in English, according to the *OED*, was not until 1463 in the household account book of Edward IV that recorded 'Expensys in brekfast'. This is at least direct evidence that some people in the royal household ate breakfast, and that they understood the word. The verb to break a fast existed much earlier, but confusingly, it could also refer to the first meal of the day in which one broke the fast, which was dinner.² So there is no indication whether breakfast as we know it was considered a regular meal, or something occasionally indulged in by those who could not make it until dinner.

By the sixteenth century physicians across Europe do refer to breakfast, but only as a meal taken by children, the elderly, sometimes by nurses who need extra nourishment, and consistently by labourers. Healthy adults, however, were told not to eat breakfast. It was generally considered a form of gluttony, along with sitting too long at the table or indulging in 'banquets' late into the night, something fully responsible humans should avoid. The very fact that they would offer warnings is, of course, itself evidence that some people did eat breakfast. But why they should have forbidden this meal is equally interesting.

First, a standard rule of dietary medicine asserted that one should never eat a meal until the previous meal has been thoroughly digested, that is, after the food has been processed and the nutrients have been distributed through the body. This normally took place in the six or so hours after dinner at around 11 a.m. and after supper at night during sleep. With far more than the required six hours of digestion during the night, one might expect physicians to approve breakfast. But they also believed it is necessary to clean out the body's passages before taking another meal. Exercise during the day accomplished this before supper, but in the morning the body was not yet 'purged of superfluities'. This would be done with the usual morning ablutions, and also with morning exercise which burns up the nutrients in a manner of speaking. In other words, one should be up and about a few hours in the morning before eating. Physicians typically recommended that the first meal not commence until four hours after rising. As Christopher Langton explains:

As concernynge the tyme of eatyng, every man whan he is hungred, if he maye have it, yet one tyme is better than another, and the very best tyme is after excersyce. For then the bodye is clere poured of all excrementes, and naturall heate is encreased, and made muche stronger.³

The natural heat would be the power to digest a meal, which presumably is too weak first thing in the morning without the fortification of some exercise.

Langton recommended meals at 11 a.m. and at 6 p.m. which was fairly typical for the mid-sixteenth century, but he also made an exception for children and the elderly whose digestive powers are weaker and who must eat much smaller meals but more frequently. The great health guru of the sixteenth century, Luigi Cornaro, admitted that he himself in old age became like a child again, eating four smaller meals through the day rather than two large ones.⁴ Thus, under ordinary circumstances two meals were considered physiologically sound. Those who did need breakfast were considered exceptions to the rule.

The importance of breakfast could also be determined by the relative size of the two major meals of the day. Where the midday meal was smaller than

the evening's we might expect breakfast to be more important, but the opposite is the case. As Lobera de Avila explains, in Venice, Genoa and Spain the custom is *mas cenar que comer*, to eat a larger evening meal because the digestive heat is stronger during sleep. In these places there should be no regular breakfast, presumably because the previous evening's meal had left people sated through the next morning. An exception to this rule would be priests, *qui ocupados de negocios spirituales sin exercicio corporal; hazen una breve colacion por la mañana en lugar de comida*.⁵ Only priests who get little exercise eat a meal early in the morning – a 'collation', and as a general rule those who do no labour should eat a larger meal in the morning rather than evening.⁶

The debate over whether the midday meal should be larger or the evening's raged throughout the medieval and early modern periods, and had a significant impact on the breakfast question. Those following Galen, who called themselves Hellenists, all agreed that the evening meal should be larger. This was also the pattern in much of southern Europe. The Arabists (generally following Avicenna as did the school of Salerno) claimed that the morning meal should be larger because a full stomach upsets sleep, and the heat of the sun and movement help digestion.⁷ This was the pattern in northern Europe. But why breakfast should be more common where there was a large morning meal is not entirely clear. Perhaps, unlike southern Europeans, northerners woke up hungry because of the smaller supper they ate.

Only the 'Conciliator' Pietro d'Abano (1250–1315) tried to mediate these arguments, insisting that only when the body is clean of superfluous humours should the evening meal be larger, but if the time between meals is small, then it is better to have a bigger midday meal.⁸ Interestingly, Nuñez de Oria who describes these arguments only mentions *almuerça* as a meal the ancients ate, so it is possible that there was no established custom of breakfast in Spain, and although the word *desayuno* was in use at this time, it too could refer to a breaking of the fast at dinner time.

There is no doubt that throughout all this discussion people followed their normal custom in the North and South, and dietary writers sometimes expressed their frustration over this. The Jesuit Leonard Lessius claimed that people will generally eat whatever they want despite physicians' counsel, usually eating until they are full, two or three times a day and then go straight to work.⁹ This is at least evidence of a third meal in the Spanish Netherlands.

Another objection to eating breakfast was the long-held idea, still current among many people in the West, that one should not exercise immediately after a meal. Theoretically, those who must work in the morning should not eat breakfast for fear that it would burn up or be forced into the veins before being properly 'concocted'. Many physicians tried to explain then how it is that

labourers can go straight to work after a meal. Melchior Sebizius claimed that long custom creates a 'second nature', and that the heat of labour helps dissipate the superfluities that in more sedentary people would form scabies or ulcers if they were to try working after a meal.¹⁰ Again, this is an argument against breakfast, but also an admission that workers do take a morning meal. Sebizius explains that among the Germans (in Strasburg) most people take only two meals, but *Famulitio manè etiam jentaculum porrigunt* (Servants often have porridge in the morning for breakfast); and *Operarios quarter cibant, jentaculo, prandio, merenda, et coena* (Workers eat four meals: breakfast, dinner, snacks at sundown, and supper).¹¹ His emphasis here suggests that only workers could be expected to need a meal first thing in the morning.

The same was the case in France where Gaspard Bachot recommended two meals for his readers but conceded to the fact that *gens de travail comme laboureurs, pescheurs, vigneronns, forgerons* must eat more often. *Faucheurs* (mowers) have a custom of eating four meals a day, even in the heat of summer and autumn.¹² Bachot had also observed *papetiers* in Thiers (Auvergne) rise at 2 a.m. and are usually having supper while others are dining, and have gone to sleep before others have supper. For workers, who seem to defy all rules, he suggests that they at least leave four hours between meals which would mean rising and eating breakfast at about 5 a.m., dining at 9 a.m., having a *merenda* (snack) at 1 p.m. and then supper at 5 p.m..¹³

The English also made a concession to the extra meals labourers must take, but Andrew Boorde limited it to three, 'and he that eate oter, lyveth a beestly lyfe'.¹⁴ His implication is that fully rational humans can control their physical urges, and workers fall somewhere between the human and the beast. Philip Moore was at least more polite in pointing out that only the idle, presumably his literate readers, must confine themselves to two meals. 'I think it bee moste wholesome for them that leade a quiet and idle life (except thei bee cholericke of complexion) to bee contente with twoo meales in one daie, that is dinner and supper. And let there be seven or eight howers between meales, and lette them eschue by all meanes possible, drinckynge or banquettyng betwene meales.'¹⁵ Breakfast then, seems only slightly less dangerous than between-meal carousing.

Adding to the argument against breakfast, Humphrey Brooke countered popular wisdom by explaining that lassitude is actually not the result of too little food, but of excess. The 'lumpishness of the limbs and senses' many believe comes from fasting because they feel this way in the morning, and to prevent it they 'carefully provide good Breakfasts'.¹⁶ He insists that this only causes greater weariness and crudities because the body is unable to digest the excess food. It also disposes one to gout. The true remedy for weakness is

abstinence. Once again, medical opinion criticizes what was obviously entrenched custom, and 'forasmuch as the generality of People are infirm', he judges it is better to omit breakfast so as to cleanse the stomach and let it be purged of superfluous moisture before eating. For those who do not labour, they eat out of custom, not hunger.¹⁷

Thomas Cogan, the Manchester schoolmaster, was among the very few authors to openly approve of breakfast. He says although the meal is not mentioned by Galen, 'nor appointed by order of the universities' it is useful for hot English complexions. 'To suffer hunger long filleth the stomack with ill humors' and robust Englishmen need something early to fill their stomachs. He even admits that the English commonly eat three meals a day, and that's fine up until age forty, after which the digestion becomes too weak to handle breakfast.¹⁸ Indirectly he also reveals what was commonly eaten. For the wealthy who eat too much manchet, a fine white bread, which can make them costive (constipated), 'a countrie mans breakefast' of brown bread and butter is a good cure for their 'fine diet'. Although he is obviously discussing the virtues of bran, he also reveals what was common breakfast fare among ordinary people.¹⁹ The 'manner of noble men' especially in cold weather, was to start with a draught of strong wine with toast dipped in for breakfast.²⁰

The only other English author to insist on the necessity of breakfast was Thomas Wingfield who pointed out that although 'Galen never ate breakefastes'; he believed them to be necessary 'in thys Realme' especially among youths and the choleric.²¹ Not all English authors would admit to the existence of breakfast though. Presumably, Edmund Hollings, a Catholic exile in Bavaria, left the customs of his native country behind. He insisted that all people are used to two meals a day only, and never even mentioned the word breakfast.²²

We get a glimpse of Scottish customs from Thomas Moffett who describes their meals: 'beginning the morning with a slender breakfast, did in old times fast till supper, feeding then but onely of one dish, using generally so temperate a diet, that not Judges and Kings, but Philosophers and Physitians seemed to have given them precepts.'²³ His comments suggest that the Scots have since changed their customs, but at the very least, there is more evidence of breakfast as a regular meal. For his countrymen he also offered a bit of bizarre advice concerning breakfast. Because the body is dramatically affected by whatever it draws in first, be it food or air, people who live in 'stinking houses or close cities' should eat breakfast regularly to be sure something wholesome enters their body first thing in the morning. Those who live in places with clear and wholesome air can fast until dinner.²⁴ The only other exceptions would be growing children, and choleric people, the heat of whose stomachs cannot tolerate emptiness. And of course labourers can eat four or five times a day if

their work is very toilsome. Once again, breakfast appears to be a regular custom in England, but only under exceptional circumstances. Elsewhere he also suggests that the best breakfasts should be of 'liquid and supping meats' because they are easier to digest as opposed to boiled meats for dinner and roast meat for supper.²⁵ Whether this reflects actual custom is difficult to tell.

William Vaughan in a dietary designed for colonists to Newfoundland approves of his own Welsh custom of eating oatmeal 'caudels' with butter and raisins. He describes this as 'breakfast to nourish a good complexion'.²⁶ Apparently the Cromwells often took a breakfast of a caudle with ale and toast, so this appears to have been an established and approved custom among the more puritanical sort, and may account for the practice in the New World as well. Another clue about breakfast in the early seventeenth century is Vaughan's comment that in cold November it is good to eat a hot loaf with butter, cinnamon and sugar in the morning.²⁷

The English writer who comes closest to the modern idea of the ideal breakfast is Tobias Venner who recommends a couple of poached eggs with salt, pepper and a drop or two of vinegar with bread and butter followed by a good draught of claret wine.²⁸ The wine, of course, would eventually be replaced by coffee or tea by the end of the seventeenth century, but here was considered a regular practice. A morning draught of wine 'hath almost with all men so farre prevailed, as that they judge it a principall meanes for the preservation of their health.'²⁹ Also conspicuous by its absence is any form of meat like bacon or sausages. These were probably considered too heavy to digest first thing in the morning, as most authors insist that breakfast should be the lightest of meals. Venner also suggests that breakfast is not necessary for 25–60-year-olds, nor for students and sedentary people.³⁰ Although clearly an established practice, physicians were still trying to dissuade some of their readers from taking it in the seventeenth century.

Joseph Duchesne, physician to Henry IV, offers some clues about what the French may have taken for breakfast, though his comments are somewhat more therapeutic than culinary. In describing early morning routine, he stresses the importance of regular bowel movements. To this end he recommends prune juice or a bouillon made with sorrel, borage, purslain, lettuce, cucumbers or similar cold herbs.³¹ He also suggests that citrus juice in the morning is good for the stomach and heart, and helps dissolve kidney stones and gravel.³² Laurent Joubert believed that early morning bouillons and *orge-mondez* (a barley concoction) were used too frequently in the morning, and urged that afterwards one should have a very light dinner to prevent the aperitive and attenuating bouillon from rushing the half-digested food into the veins and arteries.³³ In any case the juice or bouillon for breakfast seems to have been a

common practice in France, more than a medical remedy, and may also explain how coffee and tea were so easily fitted into the breakfast slot in the next centuries.

In the south of France also we find only the slightest hints. For example, Symphorien Champier asks whether one ought to eat two or three times in a day, and he tells us that this is a newly disputed topic. In the end though he says that this all depends on how much you can digest, and it is always best to follow custom.³⁴ This suggests that some people were accustomed to a third meal, and he does specify that the Germans in particular eat a meal in the morning, which he considered unusual.³⁵

Evidence of breakfast is harder to find for Italy, though Alessandro Petronio explains that in Rome the food eaten is not very nourishing which is why they need to eat more often and in greater quantity than elsewhere. Two meals a day he considered normal, but admitted that people often eat more.³⁶

All this evidence shows that breakfast up through the seventeenth century was only explicitly described and occasionally approved by English authors, and even then usually only under unusual circumstances. In southern Europe it was mentioned less frequently, and hardly ever approved, but many people appear to have eaten it anyway. All across Europe it is clear that labourers did eat breakfast. It is only toward the eighteenth century that the custom spread upward, as it were. This may be due, partly to the replacement of alcohol for breakfast with the new drinks: coffee, tea and chocolate. These added not only a feeling of exotic luxury to the morning meal, but could be touted as medicinal and therefore appropriate for those who had to find an excuse to eat something early. On top of that, the invigorating drinks, especially coffee, were seen as morally sound for industrious Protestants before they took off for work.³⁷ It took some time for these beverages to make their way from the coffee houses into people's homes, but once they did, it may have also legitimized breakfast.

There were, of course, just as many doctors who condemned coffee and tea as those who praised it. The heat of the arguments itself is evidence that the custom was becoming more and more widespread in the eighteenth century, and a regular feature of breakfast. For example, George Cheyne, who generally approved of these drinks in moderation said 'Green Tea, which when light, and drank neither too Strong nor too Hot, I take to be a proper Diluent, when soften'd with a little Milk, to cleanse the alimentary Passages, and wash off the Scorbutick and Urinous Salts, for a Breakfast, to those who live full and free.'³⁸ His comments also suggest that serious dieters (who do not live full and free) will want to approach these with caution, but for ordinary people they are fine. For his patients, however, and for those who 'much Use of their intellectual

Faculties, or who would indulge speculative Studies' he recommends thinking in the early morning 'till eleven a Clock, then to take some agreeable Breakfast of vegetable food.' Apart from his bent toward vegetables, this is essentially what physicians of past centuries recommended – nothing at all first thing in the morning.³⁹

For most physicians though, breakfast was an approved and firmly established custom by the mid-eighteenth century in England, and again the reason for this was probably pushing dinner into the afternoon. What is unexplainable however is the fact that mealtimes were even later in southern Europe and breakfast never became a regular meal there. Taking chocolate in the morning persisted in Spain and elsewhere as a very small morning nibble, but nothing like the grand breakfasts of northern Europe ever developed. Whether this was the result of a very late evening meal or the lingering medical idea that two meals in a day are sufficient for a healthy adult is impossible to say, but the pattern persists to this day.

NOTES

- ¹ Martial, *Epigrams*, 14,223.
- ² Bridget Anne Henisch, *Fast and Feast: Food in Medieval Society*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976, pp. 21–23. In discussing meal times William Harrison has some interesting comments: ‘of old we had breakfast in the forenoon, beverages or nunchions after dinner, and thereto rear suppers generally when it was time to go to rest...Now, these odd repasts – thanked be God! – are very well left, and each one in manner (except here and there some young, hungry stomach that cannot fast till dinner-time) contenteth himself with dinner and supper only.’ William Harrison, ‘A Description of England ... for Holinshed’s Chronicles’, in *Chronicle and Romance*, N.Y.: P.F. Collier and Son, 1910, p. 302.
- ³ Christopher Langton, *An Introduction to Phisycke with an universal dyet*, n.d. [1550?], facsimile ed. Amsterdam and New York: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum and Da Capo Press, 1970), p. lxxix.
- ⁴ Luigi Cornaro, *How to regain Health and Live a Hundred Years*, London: Marshall Bros., 1894, p. 21.
- ⁵ Luis Lobera de Avila, *Vergel di sanidad*, Alcala de Henares: Joan de Brocar, 1542, fol. XV.
- ⁶ *Ibid.*, fol. XVv. *Si vero paucis debilibus exercitijs et parvis ocupationibus in vita utantur, praecipuum est ipsis melius prandere quam coenare.* The word collation eventually came to mean a late-night snack of delicacies, but was originally a small meal eaten in monasteries while reading Cassian’s *Collations*.
- ⁷ Melchior Sebizius, *De alimentorum facultatibus*, Strasbourg: Joannis Philippi et Josiae Stedelii, 1650, p. 1288. See also Gaspard Bachot, *Erreurs populaires touchant la medecine et la regime de sante*, Lyon: Barthelemy Vincent, 1626, pp. 434–7.
- ⁸ Francisco Nuñez de Oria, *Regimiento y aviso de sanidad*, Medina del Campo: Francisco del Canto, 1586, p. 59. Adding to this confusion, Avicenna claimed that digestion takes a full 16 hours, and so people should only eat meals every 16 hours, twice on some days and once on others. The most complete discussion of this debate is Oddo degli Oddi, *De coenae et prandii portione libri duo*, Lyons: Jean Barbous for Gennain Rose, 1538, which argues the Hellenist position that supper should be larger. He does mention that servants and workers do eat a larger supper, and wonders how they can remain healthy, but he does not mention breakfast, *‘quam, solam servitutem vulgus appellat: praeterea, quae dicta sunt, in die solita quoque munia et aliquando insueta obeant, nocte verò quiescant, ubi maius quidem prandium, minorem autem coenam ingesserint, nescio, qua ratione in incommoda evitare poterint.’*
- ⁹ Leonard Lessius, *Hygiasticon*, Cambridge, 1634, p. 12.
- ¹⁰ Sebizius, p. 1369.
- ¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 1392.
- ¹² Bachot, p. 388.
- ¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 432–3.
- ¹⁴ Andrew Boorde, *A compendious Regyment or A Dyetary of Helth*, ed. F.J. Furnivall, London: Early English Text Society, 1870, p. 251.
- ¹⁵ Philip Moore, *The hope of health*, London: John Kingston, 1565, p. 22.
- ¹⁶ Humphrey Brooke, *YTIEINH or A Conservatory of Health*, London: R.W. for O. Whittington, 1650, pp. 106–7.
- ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 127. Brooke also argues against the current English custom of eating a larger dinner than supper. The evening meal should be larger because the heat draws inward at night fortifying digestion. During the day the ambient heat attracts the body’s natural heat and weakens digestion, just as it does in summer, or even sitting in front of a fire. All this would dissuade a careful reader from eating large meals during the day, including breakfast. Brooke, p. 129.
- ¹⁸ Thomas Cogan, *The Haven of Health*, London: Thomas Orwin, 1589, pp. 181–2.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

- ²⁰ Ibid., p. 215.
- ²¹ Henry Wingfield, *A compendious or short treatise ... preceptes necessary to the preservation of health*, London: Robert Stoughten, 1551, p. Biii^v.
- ²² Edmund Hollings, *De salubri studiosorum victu*, Ingolstadt: Typis Ederisnia, per Anrea Angermarium, 1602, pp. 44–5.
- ²³ Thomas Moffett, *Health's Improvement*, London: Thomas Newcomb, 1655, p. 261.
- ²⁴ Ibid., pp. 289–91.
- ²⁵ Ibid., p. 296.
- ²⁶ William Vaughan, *Naturall and artificial directions for health*, London: Richard Braddocke, 1600, p. 32. Vaughan also recommends 'stale' beer in the morning with sugar to combat melancholy, which he considers even better than wine (p. 34). Like other English authors, he also believes that three meals a day, breakfast, dinner and supper, are fine until age 40. Breakfast should be the smallest meal of the three (p. 291).
- ²⁷ Ibid., p. 269.
- ²⁸ Tobias Venner, *Via recta ad vitam longam*, London: Edward Griffen for Richard Moore, 1620, p. 87.
- ²⁹ Ibid., p. 193.
- ³⁰ Ibid., p. 177.
- ³¹ Joseph Duchesne, *Le pourtraict de santé* (Paris: Claude Moral, 1606), p. 360–61.
- ³² Ibid., p. 406.
- ³³ Laurent Joubert, *Erreurs populaires*, Book II, Rouen: George L'oyselet, 1587, p. 44.
- ³⁴ Symphorien Champier, *Roxa gallica*, Paris: Iodoco Badio, 1518, pp. 30v–31.
- ³⁵ Ibid., p. 33v. *Vespere igitur et mane reficiendum est non in meridie: vel circa: ut nonnulli faciunt: et praesertim Alenanni.*
- ³⁶ Alessandro Petronio, *Del viver delli Romani et di conservar la sanità*, Rome: Domenico Basa, 1592, p. 196.
- ³⁷ Wolfgang Schivelbusch, *Tastes of Paradise*, tr. David Jacobson, New York: Vintage Books, 1993. The author argues that chocolate was the ideal drink for the indolent Spanish nobility while coffee and then tea were more suited to the industrious Protestant bourgeois North.
- ³⁸ George Cheyne, *An Essay on Health and Long Life* (1724), facsimile, N.Y.: Arno Press, 1979, p. 62.
- ³⁹ Ibid., p. 86.