Short Communications

MEXICO AND COLOMBIA: TWO MAJOR CENTRES OF ABORIGINAL USE OF HALLUCINOGENS

It has often been wondered why the New World is so much richer in species of plants used for hallucinogenic purposes than the Old World. There have been attempts to explain this apparent discrepancy on the basis of cultural background (LaBarre 1970). There is certainly no botanical reason why the New World flora should be considered to be richer or poorer in potential hallucinogens than the Old World, so it may not be explained on the basis of greater availability of hallucinogenic plants in the Western Hemisphere (Schultes 1973).

When one considers the New World, moreover, one is struck with the great disparity in use of hallucinogens in various parts of North, Central and South America. North America (north of and exclusive of Mexico) is





rather poor in the use of hallucinogenic plants. The great expanse of Brazil and the Argentine in South America (excluding the Amazon Valley) is very obviously poor in plants employed for the induction of visions and other hallucinations, Guianas, the West Indies and all of Central America have yielded little of interest in this respect.

Mexico and Colombia stand out, nonetheless, as the two areas where primitive societies most assiduously have employed hallucinogenic plants in magico-religious, medical or divinatory rituals. A brief review of the rich ethnopharmacologic store of the peoples who made up the advanced pre-Colombian civilizations of Mexico and the Chibcha and other cultures_of Colombia and an evaluation of the tradition which both have left for modern societies may be illuminating.

The ethnopharmacopoeia of hallucinogenic drugs appears to be richest in Mexico. The number of plants

ournal of Psychedelic Drugs

SCHULTES

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS

employed for their hallucinogenic properties and known to the ancients is very large: peyote (Lophophora Williamsii, L. diffusa); sinicuichi (Heimia salicifolia); piule, (Rhynchosia spp.); ololiuqui (Rivea corymbosa); tlitliltzin (Ipomoea violacea); toloache (Datura spp.);



Drawing of the ololiuqui of the ancient Aztecs (Rivea corymbosa) still used in Oaxaca. From the Florentino Codex of Sahagún's Historia de las cosas de la Nueva España, written during the middle of the 16th Century. properties. Evidence that other Mexican plants were used or are being used in aboriginal cultures is turning up. There are growing indications that even tobacco (*Nicotiana Tabacum* and *N. rustica*) occasionally has hallucinogenic effects as employed in certain native New World (including Mexican) ceremonies.

Colombia – with its Andean, Amazonian and coastal areas, not to mention its Orinoco basin and the northwest sectors of the Chocó – represents undoubtedly the richest phytogeographic part of the New World and the region where, it appears, primitive societies most valued hallucinogenic drugs. This Republic can count on a large number of psychoactively employed plants: Datura arborea, D. aurea, D. dolichocarpa, D. sanguinea, D. suaveolens and D. vulcanicola; Methysticodendron Amesianum; Iochroma fuchsioides; Banisteriopsis Caapi, B. inebrians, B. Rusbyana; Psychotria viridis; Coriaria thymifolia; Anadenanthora (Piptadenia) peregrina;



Flowering vine of Ipomoea violacea, probable source of the tlitliltzin of the ancient Aztecs and still employed in Oaxaca.

Photo: R.G. Wasson

Vol. 9(No. 2) Apr-Jun, 1977

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS

SCHULTES

Virola calophylla, V. calophylloidea, V. theiodora; possibly Tetrapteris methystica and others.

Why these two parts of the New World – Mexico and Colombia – should be so rich in plant hallucinogens can only be guessed at the present time, but a partial reason may be the wealth of the floras of these two areas: especially Colombia, with an estimated flora of 50,000 species of higher plants (Schultes 1951). Mexico



Makuna medicine-man gathering stems of Banisteriopsis Caapi for preparation of narcotic caapi drink. Río Popeyacá, Amazonas, Colombia.

Photo: R.E. Schultes

Vol. 9(No. 2) Apr-Jun, 1977

SHORT COMMUNICATIONS

De PYCIELT, SeuTabaco. Cap. LI.



PLANTAM, quam Mexicenfes Pycielt, feu Telt vocant, ab Hitinis appellatur T abacus, à quibus non ad Indos solos, fed & ad Hispanos id defluxit nomé, eò quod fuffumigijs admifceretur, qua Tabacos etiam nuncupare confucuerunt . à Brafilianis Petum, ab alijs Herba facra, à nonnullis Nicotiana dicitur. Non eft autem vna Species: huius plantæ species . alij namque tres in. hoc antiquo Orbe reperiri affirmant, ac plantam hanc in Tabacum maiorem, minorem, & minimum partiuntur . At quia_ maioris, minorisq; Tabaci differentia pufilla eft (confiftit enim in magnitudine, & longitudine, ac adhærentia foliorum fine pediculis cauli , vt in maiori obleruatur , in minori verò folium eft paulò minus, longo pediculo ramis inharens, ac florum positura; cumq; id ob causas mutationes in plantis efficientes, latius in procemio explicatas contingere potucrit) non immerito duz

funt tantum species, qua observantur in hac nova Hispania, quarum alteram species I Pycielt, alteram verò Quauhyelt appellant. Pycielt ergo herba eft, folia ferens p lata, oblonga, ac Perfonatæ quadantenus fimilia. caules, quinque pluresvè do-drantes longos, atque hirfutos, inconditos, ftriatos, & læues. flores Hyofcyami lutei fimiles,eisq; decidentibus valcula prædicti Hyolcyami æmula, referta lemine pufillo, Papaueris minore, ac ex rufo nigricante . radicem breuem , non species II. admodum tenuem, sed fibratam . Quauhyels verò in magnam assurgens alti Quauhyels tudinem, Allyriam Malum, Limoné vocatá, zquat . Caule recto multos emittente ramos, & in eis folia mali Affyrij longiora, hirfuta , colore viridi dilutiore, vii tota planta diffuía . interdumque folia, foli , & cœli ratione variantur . quandoque enim cubitalem longitudinem, ac pedalem latitudinem affecura fine pediculo caulem amplectuntur . nonnumquam verò folia minora , pediculis inhærentia ramis conspiciuntur. Flores Campanulæ instar fert, concauos, ac per extremum fex, feptemuè angulis diftinctos, candicantes, medio verò purpurescentes, ordine per ramulorum longitudinem dispositos . quibus succedunt capitula Ocymoidi fimilia, maiora tamé , plena femine pufillo ex cine-P 3 rco

Reproduction of the illustration of Nicotiana rustica and a portion of the discussion of tobacco from Hernandez' Rerum medicarum Novae Hispaniae thesaurus, seu plantarum, animalium, mineralium mexicanorum historia, published in 1651.

had a very highly developed and narcotic-oriented culture at the time of the Conquest. Colombia apparently did not. The Chibcha culture, which overshadowed most of Colombia, was not so highly advanced as the Mexican cultures, nor was it as sophisticated as that of the neighbouring Inca Empire to the south.

We know as yet relatively little about the use of hallucinogens by the Chibchas and members of their empire. More and more information is becoming available as archaeological progress is being made. The use of so many hallucinogens in present cultures in Colombia and their importance, however, assure us of the antiquity of the custom (Uscátegui 1959). The well established utilization of hallucinogenic drugs in ceremonies in both the Andean and Amazonian parts of Colombia is, however, well recognized and most certainly must be significant of antiquity of use.

An important aspect concerning these two geographic parts of New World use of hallucinogens pertains to the fact that there are no two species used commonly in both areas. And, except for the genus *Datura*, even the genera and plant families are usually not the same. With *Datura*, the species employed – although possessing the same active chemical constituents – are wholly distinct, and the South American species are often considered to represent a different genus, *Brugmansia*.

Mexico and Colombia stand out as the two areas where native cultures in pre-Columbian times used - and still use - the greatest number of plant species for their hallucinogenic purposes. The reasons may not yet be clear, but modern research does indicate that even more hallucinogens are employed in Mexico and Colombia than those now known. And, furthermore, there is evidence that we still do not botanically know all of the hallucinogenic plants used in either of these countries. The years to come are certain to amplify the list.

REFERENCES

LaBarre, W. 1970. Old and New World narcotics: a statistical question and an ethnological reply. *Economic Botany* Vol. 24: 73-80.

F

F

ċ

P

d

p

S

ti

d

с

h

с

a

S

Γ

И

W

b

r

a

n

e

P

- Ott, J. 1976. Hallucinogenic Plants of North America. Berkeley: Wingbow Press.
- Safford, W.E. 1917. Narcotic plants and stimulants of the ancient Americans. Annual Report. Smithsonian Institution. 1916: 387-424.
- Schultes, R.E. 1976. Hallucinogenic Plants New York: Golden Press.
- Schultes, R.E. 1951. La riqueza de la flora colombiana. Revista de la Academia colombiania de ciencias exactas, físicas y naturales Vol. 8: 230-242.
- Schultes, R.E. & Hofmann, A. 1973. The Botany and Chemistry of Hallucinogens. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas.
- Uscátegui M., N. 1960-61. Distribución actual de las plantas narcóticas y estimulantes usadas por las tribus indígenas de Colombia. Revista de la Academia colombiania de ciencias exactas, físicas y naturales Vol. 11: 215-228.
- Uscátegui M., N. 1959. The present distribution of narcotics and stimulants amongst the Indian tribes of Colombia. *Botanical Museum Leaflets* (Harvard University) Vol. 18: 273-304.

Richard Evans Schultes, Ph.D. Paul C. Mangelsdorf Professor of Natural Sciences Director, Botanical Museum Harvard University, Oxford Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138.