

Provenance report regarding The Banjarmasin Diamond

Klaas Stutje


	Custodian	Rijksmuseum Amsterdam
	Current possessor	Dutch State
	Inventory number	NG-C-2000-3
	Material/technique	Diamond (mineral); grinding
	Measurements	21.86 x 17.37 x 13.86 mm 38.23 (metric) carat 7.65 grams

Photo: Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, inv.no. NG-C-2000-3

Summary of findings

Based on the research report below we can draw the following preliminary conclusions: From the pre-1859 period we have a handful of Dutch sources that indicate the existence of a 70 carat diamond in the possession of the Sultan of Banjarmasin, some more reliable than others and the earliest from 1829. Based on Dutch sources found in the archives of the Dutch Ministry of Colonies in The Hague we can also conclude that the Banjarmasin Diamond in the Rijksmuseum was ceded “voluntarily” but under extreme pressure by Sultan Tamdjidillah II (1817-1867) to representatives of the Dutch colonial state on the day after his abdication on 24 June 1859. After two and a half years in colonial depots in Banjarmasin and Batavia, the Gouverneur Generaal sent the diamond to the Netherlands in December 1861, with the intention of offering it to the Dutch King William III. The Council of Ministers decided otherwise, and in the next four decades the Ministry of Colonies tried to find a suitable location for the diamond. The Ministry also tried to sell the diamond three times, for which it was cut to a stone of 38,23 metric carat by A.E. Daniëls (1813-1903) and son in 1869-1870. Finally, in August 1902, the diamond was given on permanent loan to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, “as a memorial to the subjugation of the Banjarmasin empire.”

Reconstruction provenance

[no date] - 3 November 1857

Sultan Adam of Banjarmasin or his direct family

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857.

3 November 1857 - 25 June 1859

Sultan Tamdjidillah II of Banjarmasin or his direct family

Van Rees, De Bandjermasinsche Krijg, part I, 28; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857.

25 June 1859 - 7 April 1862

Resident of South-East Borneo

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of a letter of the resident to the Gouvernements Commissaris of 26 June 1859.

7 April 1862 - 22 Augustus 1902

Ministry of Colonies in The Hague

NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1173, 24 April 1862 no. 22, receipt note and verbaal 7 April 1862.

22 Augustus 1902 - today

Rijksmuseum Amsterdam

2.02.04 – inv.nr. 5237, Verbaal 19 juli 1902, nr. 35, Minutes Directeur RMA en makelaar Vita Israel, dd. 22 augustus 1902.

Object information

In 1862 the stone arrived in the Netherlands as a rough diamond that weighed 70 carat.¹ Fransen van der Putte (1822-1902), former Minister of Colonies, said in 1897 that before its cut the diamond was “for a layman not pretty, looking like a piece of charcoal.”² Between May and August 1870 the stone was cut by the Amsterdam-based cutters A.E. Daniëls and son, managing directors of the factory of the late M.E. Coster (1791-1849). According to a gemological analysis of S. Van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, the

¹ In 1864 it was remeasured at 69 and 7/8 carat. This is measured in ‘old carats.’ In 1907, the measurement of diamonds was internationally standardised. 1 ‘old carat’ equaled 1,0276 ‘metric carat,’ Klaas Akkerman, “‘Een hart, extraordinair groot,’ De geschiedenis van de grootste diamant in Oranjebezit,” *Antiek* 24 (1989), 290.

² *Handelingen der Eerste Kamer, 27^{ste} vergadering, 30 April 1897, p. 384: “De diamant is ongeslepen, voor een leek niet mooi; zij gelijk op een stukje steenkool (...)”*

diamond weighs 38.23 carat. In size, the diamond is 21.86 x 17.37 x 13.86 mm (l x w x h). The diamond is rectangular shaped and can be described as a modified Old Mine Cut.³

Provenance report

Before 1857

The diamond producing industry in the region around Martapura in South-Kalimantan, historically the centre of the Banjarmasin Sultanate and after its abolition part of the Dutch residency of Southeast Borneo, has a very long history. Until the discovery of diamonds in Brazil in the 1725, it was one of the two regions in the world where diamonds were found, and until the twentieth century the region had a small diamond polishing industry.⁴ Although the share of diamonds from the Martapura region on the world market has never been large, they have always played an important role in the local export economy and in the Sultan's tributary power system. The Sultan and prominent members of his family held the exclusive rights over a few mine pits and leased the right to exploit other pits to vassals. Diamonds not only played a role as lubricant in the Sultan's economy, but the largest among them were also carried as jewels and symbols of power.⁵ The diamond in Rijksmuseum Amsterdam was one of them.

Most historians start the provenance history of the diamond in Rijksmuseum Amsterdam in the 1830s, referring to a travelogue of Salomon Müller (1804-1864).⁶ This German zoologist, who travelled in Banjarmasin in 1836 and published his travelogue in between 1839 and 1844, wrote that Sultan Adam Al-Watsiq Billah (ca. 1771-1857) was in possession of a rough diamond of – according to the Sultan himself – 77 carat. The shape of the diamond was an “almost regular octahedron.” It was cast in gold, hung around the Sultan's neck with a simple chord, and belonged to his “most valuable showpieces”. Müller describes this diamond in a section in which he contrasts the Sultan's riches with the dilapidated state of Martapura and the kraton.⁷ According to Müller, the 77-carat diamond was found in a diamond pit near kampong Goenong-lawak that was owned by the Sultan and his son, and the finder “only” received 500 *Spaanse matten* (Spanish dollars) or 1,275 Dutch guilders.⁸

Müller was not the first European to write about a large diamond worn around the neck of the Sultan. The *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant en Algemeen Handelsblad* wrote in 1833 that in 1823 the youngest son of Sultan Sulaiman Saidullah II (1761-1825) wore a diamond of “68, but according to some 72” carat

³ S. van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, “Banjarmasin diamond,” *The Journal of Gemmology* (forthcoming).

⁴ Karin Hofmeester, Ashkan Ashkpour, Katrien Depuydt, Jesse De Does, “Diamonds in Borneo: Commodities as Concepts in Context,” DATeCH2019: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Digital Access to Textual Cultural Heritage, May 2019, pp. 45–50.

⁵ René Brus, “Diamanten uit Kalimantan,” *Orion, tweemaandelijks oriënterend tijdschrift Nederland/Indonesië* 3, no. 5 (September/October 1987); Salomon Müller, *Verhandelingen over de natuurlijke geschiedenis der Nederlandsche overzeesche bezittingen* (Leiden: C.J. Temminck 1837-1844), 420, 423-424.

⁶ Brus, “Diamanten uit Kalimantan,”; Akkerma, ‘Een hart, extraordinair groot,’ 286; Caroline Drieënhuizen, “Een ‘lelijk vuil ding’: een diamant in het Rijksmuseum en de doorwerking van koloniaal denken,” <https://carolinedrieenhuizen.wordpress.com> (published 26 september 2017); see also the 2013-2018 information sign of the diamond in Rijksmuseum.

⁷ Müller, *Verhandelingen over de natuurlijke geschiedenis*, 420: “nagenoeg regelmatigen octaëder”, “zijne kostbaarste pronkstukken.”

⁸ *Ibidem*, 421, 424. Kampong Goenong-lawak was a short distance South-southwest of Kampong Oedjoeng-Moeroeng, which was a few hours walking distance south of Martapura.

on a green chord around his neck.⁹ In 1829, “an inhabitant of Banjarmasin” visited these royal diamond pits and described in the *Javasche Courant* a 77 carat diamond, which was cast in a golden band and worn as a necklace by the Sultan himself with a simple black chord.¹⁰ In 1837, the Dutch botanist P.W. Korthals (1807-1892) also reported about an “almost regular octahedron” from the diamond pits around Goenong Lawak in the possession of the Sultan. In publications he stated that the diamond was 72 carat, but in his diary he reported that it was 76 carat.¹¹ Finally, a diamond of “more than 70 carat” was mentioned in a travelogue of “an official of the Government” in 1838, and a 77 carat diamond by the Dutch agriculturalist M.D. Teenstra (1795-1864) in 1848.¹²

It is remarkable that the accounts differ in details – with diamonds between 68 and 77 carat, with black or green chords, cast in gold or silver, and with various remunerations for the miners – but share a similar narrative in which a large diamond hangs around the neck of the Sultan on a simple chord. A diamond of this size in combination with the shape of a regular octahedron is extremely rare, and the fact that it is mentioned several times leads gemologist Suzanne van Leeuwen to the conclusion that these sources refer to the same diamond.¹³ The repeated appearance of this diamond in Dutch sources between 1823 and 1848 not only indicates that it was a cherished object of subsequent Sultans, but also bears witness to an orientalist fascination of Dutch observers for this diamond, foreshadowing its later confiscation.

A last Dutch source that deserves attention confirms the existence of a 70-carat diamond among the Sultan’s regalia just before the Dutch offensive of 1859. Between 1863 and 1865 W.A. van Rees (1820-1898), a retired major of the Dutch colonial army wrote the voluminous work *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg van 1859 tot 1863* as an homage to his former employer. In a section in which he describes the regular procedure of the coronation and inauguration of a new sultan before the abolition of this position in 1860, he underlines the importance of the state regalia: “A Sultan without regalia [*rijkssieraden*] is unconceivable.”¹⁴ Van Rees then proceeds to describe twenty of the most important items, including two diamonds of 120 and 70 carat. This mention of the 70-carat diamond in combination with a diamond of 120 carat is interesting, because it indicates that Van Rees, who did his research in the Netherlands at the department of the Ministry of Colonies, did not base this description of twenty on the collection that entered the museum of the Bataviaasch Genootschap in Batavia in November 1861 but had other, yet unidentified sources to tell him about the Banjarmasin regalia.¹⁵

⁹ “Het Eiland Borneo (Vervolg en Slot van Nummer 377),” *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant en Algemeen Handelsblad*, January 17, 1833, 4: “68, volgens sommigen van 72 karaat.”

¹⁰ “Correspondentie,” *Javasche Courant*, 29 October 1829, 2.

¹¹ P.W.Korthals, ‘Aanteekeningen over Borneo’s Zuidoostkust,’ *Algemeene konst- en letter-bode, voor het jaar...* 47 (1837) 245.

¹² “Borneo, Eenige reizen in de Binnenlanden van dit Eiland, door eenen Ambtenaar van het Gouvernement in het jaar 1824,” *Tijdschrift voor Neerland’s Indië* 1, no. 2 (1838), 17: “ruim 70 karaten”; M.D. Teenstra, *Beknopte beschrijving van de Nederlandsch Overzeesche Bezittingen*, vol. 5-6 (Groningen: J. Oomkens, J. Zoon 1848) 447.

¹³ Personal correspondence with Suzanne van Leeuwen, gemologist Rijksmuseum Amsterdam, 4 March 2021. The author wants to thank Suzanne van Leeuwen for sharing early mentions of the diamond.

¹⁴ W.A. Van Rees, *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg van 1859-1863*, part I (Arnhem: D.A. Thieme, 1865), 28: “Een sulthan zonder rijkssieraden was niet denkbaar.” The importance of state regalia for the Sultan’s authority is also demonstrated by the fact that one of the later contenders to the Banjarmasin throne, Pangeran Antasari, made the acquisition of the regalia one of his main strategies to power: *Verzameling der Merkwaardigste Vonnissen geweest door de krijgsraad te velde in de zuid- en oosterafdeeling van Borneo gedurende de jaren 1859-1864* (Batavia: Landsdrukkerij, 1865) 33.

¹⁵ Cf. “Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861,” *Tijdschrift van het Bataviaasch Genootschap* 12 (1862), 122-125; *Katalogus der Ethnologische Afdeling van het Museum van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* (Batavia: Lange & Co 1868), 95-98.

1857-1862

On 3 November 1857, two days after the death of Sultan Adam, Tamdjidillah al-Watsiq Billah was inaugurated in Martapura as the new sultan. This was not self-evident, but an escalation of a dynastic conflict between several contenders for the Sultan's throne and an interventionist Dutch colonial state. In 1852, the first son of Sultan Adam and heir to the throne, Abdul Rakhman (?-1852), died, allegedly poisoned by one of his younger brothers, Prabu Anom (?-1869). It was unclear who would succeed Abdul Rakhman as the new crown prince. Prabu Anom was supported by his mother Nyai Ratu Kemala Sari (ca. 1765-1864), Sultan Adam's wife who exerted great influence on the governance of the Sultanate and even held the royal seal. However, Kemala Sari and her son Prabu Anom were greatly disliked by the Dutch because of their supposed greed and cruelty and anti-Dutch attitude. The Dutch government preferred Tamdjidillah (1817-1867), the first son of Abdul Rakhman and nephew of Prabu Anom, who had established good relations with European circles in Banjarmasin city and had promised to grant the colonial government the exploitation of all coal mines within the borders of the Banjarmasin sultanate. However, this prince was very unpopular with the Banjarese population, because his Chinese-Dayak mother was not of royal descent, and because he allegedly spent most of his time in European circles in Banjarmasin city. A final candidate was the second son of Abdul Rakhman, Hidayatullah (1822-1903), whose mother was also a niece of Abdul Rakhman. Hidayatullah was thus of double royal descent. Most Banjarese regarded Hidayatullah as the rightful heir to the throne.¹⁶

Sultan Adam was too old to settle this dynastic dispute over his succession, and in 1856 the Dutch made use of their right to appoint a royal successor, which they had acquired in 1787 after the VOC stepped into a previous dynastic conflict. They elected Tamdjidillah as the crown prince, despite the latter's unpopularity with the Banjarese population and court. The lack of support for Tamdjidillah was symbolised by the fact that he did not live in the kraton of Martapura, which for centuries had been the center of the Banjarese court, but preferred to stay in the town of Banjarmasin, near the protection of the Dutch Resident and colonial army.¹⁷

On 1 November 1857, Sultan Adam died, and two days later Tamdjidillah was hurriedly installed by the Resident. This happened against the will of the other claimants to the throne, Prabu Anom backed by his mother Kemala Sari, and Hidayatullah. According to Van Rees, Kemala Sari, as the wife of the late Sultan Adam, held most of the regalia and some others were in use by her nephew kiay Adiphati Danu Redjo and by Hidayatullah.¹⁸ On the day of Tamdjidillah's inauguration Kemala Sari and Hidayatullah refused to hand over a few important regalia in their possession. Only after long deliberations they

¹⁶ Helius Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries: The Social, Political, Ethnic and Dynastic Roots of Resistance in South and Central Kalimantan, 1859-1906" (PhD diss., Monash University, 1989), 86-95.

¹⁷ Ibidem, 111-112.

¹⁸ Van Rees, *De Bandjermasinsche Krijg*, part I, 28.

ceded the regalia and the inauguration of Tamdjidillah could continue.¹⁹ From this moment on we may assume that Tamdjidillah was in secure possession of all of the regalia of Banjarmasin, including the 70-carat diamond.²⁰

With the installation, political and social tensions in Banjarese society were far from resolved. Historians have identified and explored several underlying economic,²¹ religious,²² and socio-political²³ dimensions of the conflict. In the months after Tamdjidillah's accession, Prabu Anom and his mother Kemala Sari were arrested and exiled to Java. Hidayatullah retained some power with his popular support base and in function as *mangkubumi* ('rijksbestierder,' official intermediate between the sultan and resident), but he was greatly distrusted by the Dutch colonial government and Tamdjidillah. Fearing a similar treatment as Prabu Anom, Hidayatullah preferred to keep distance from the Dutch and Tamdjidillah and in June 1859 he even fled from Martapura. Moreover, between 28 April and 11 May 1859, followers of a nativistic movement of Panembahan Aling (?-1860) started attacking Dutch coal mines in the Sultan's lands and Christian missionary outposts of the Rheinische Missionsgesellschaft. In total 33 European civilians were killed. As a reaction, the Dutch colonial government replaced the Resident with a military commander, A.J. Andresen (1808-1872), and sent large numbers of troops to quell the revolt. Moreover, the Dutch tried to regain control over the Banjarese aristocracy by occupying the kraton in Martapura and demanding public loyalty of the many princes and nobility.

In June 1859, more than one month after the first attacks on Dutch positions had occurred, the Dutch Gouvernements Commissaris and Kolonel A.J. Andresen summoned about eighty prominent leaders of Martapura and their followers to listen to their demands, in a desperate attempt to appease the Banjarese population. In Dutch sources from the Ministry of Colonies archive in The Hague we can read that these leaders made clear that the dethronement of Tamdjidillah was a necessary precondition for peace. Therefore, Andresen returned to Banjarmasin to urge Tamdjidillah to step down 'voluntarily,' applying heavy pressure. On 24 June 1859, he confronted the Sultan in the Resident's office by saying that the elite and the population of Banjarmasin had lost faith in him, because of his negligence of the requirements of the Islam and because his accession to the throne was against the *adat* (customary law). Andresen also indirectly blamed Tamdjidillah for the recent attacks on Europeans by saying that

¹⁹ Nationaal Archief, Den Haag [NL-HaNA], Ministerie van Koloniën, nummer toegang 2.10.02, inventarisnummer 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, 'Historische Nota over het voorgevallene met de beide mededingers naar de Bandjermasinsche troon' by the gouvernementssecretaris; ibidem, inv.nr. 680, verbaal 29 January 1858 no. 36, copy of a letter of the Resident of Southeast Borneo to the Gouverneur Generaal, 4 November 1857. According to this letter it concerned the Sultan's golden throne and payung, two ancient pikes and two holy krisses.

See also NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 52, 'Resumé der korrespondentie omtrent de aangelegenheden van het Martapoerasche hof, Aanbieding verklaring Pangeran Praboe,' 219-223.

²⁰ Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule," 155. Yet, we have to keep in mind that some of the regalia that ended up in Batavia were inextricably linked to the kraton in Martapura, such as for instance the two copper cannons named Sri/Sari Banjar which were positioned right in front of the kraton. This suggests that Tamdjidillah, who resided in Banjarmasin, did not have all of the regalia at his immediate disposal. See "Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861, 124; *Katalogus der Ethnologische Afdeling*, 97.

²¹ For instance, S.C.P. Kreuger, *Zr.Ms. Onrust: Verraad en ondergang in Borneo* (Amsterdam: Van Soeren, 1994).

²² For instance, Karl E. Böhmer, "Violence Begets Violence: Anticolonial Mobilisation of Ressentiment in 19th Century Borneo," *Studia Historiae Ecclesiasticae* 45, no. 1 (2019); Helius Sjamsuddin, "Islam and resistance in South and Central Kalimantan in the nineteenth and early twentieth century," in *Islam in the Indonesian Social Context*, ed. M.C. Ricklefs (Clayton, Victoria: Monash University, 1991); Mujiburrahman Al-Banjari, "Historical Dynamics Of Inter-Religious Relations In South Kalimantan," *Journal of Indonesian Islam* 11-1 (2017) 145-174.

²³ For instance, Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule"; Idwar Saleh, "Agrarian Radicalism"; H.G. Mayur S.H., *Perang Banjar* (Banjarmasin, CV.Rapi: 1979)

these were conducted by the population of the Sultan's private lands, for which the Sultan would be held accountable once the criminal investigation was finished. Andresen made clear that the Indies government no longer felt obliged to protect the Sultan against internal opposition, as had been part of the Dutch-Banjarmasin-treaties. He suggested that the Sultan would resign "of his own free will," offering him and his family safe passage to Batavia, an independent investigation in the affairs, a continuing monthly allowance in accordance with his dignity, and the continued right to carry the title of sultan.²⁴ Tamdjidillah, knowing that his life was in danger without the protection of the Dutch,²⁵ had little choice but to "submit to the advice of the Gouvernements Commissaris" under the precondition that a new sultan would be installed according to the Banjarese adat once the uprising had ended and order was restored. He also agreed to surrender the Banjarmasin's regalia the following day.²⁶

The emphasis in Dutch official correspondence on the voluntary character of Tamdjidillah's abdication and surrender of the Banjarmasin regalia probably stems from concerns over the reaction of the Banjarese population and elite. For the same reason they asked Tamdjidillah to write a public announcement in which he declared to resign as a Sultan "out of my own free will and without any coercion."²⁷ Yet, in later sources, when the regalia were already shipped out of Banjarmasin, the official document produced at the moment of surrender was referred to as "the Report of Confiscation," leaving little doubt about its involuntary character.²⁸

On 25 June 1859, the Resident of Southeast-Borneo C.J. Bosch (?-?), together with two lower officials Müller (?-?) and Walbeecken (?-?), went to the Sultan's residence to collect the Banjarmasin regalia. While the Sultan tried in vain to renegotiate some of the agreements of the day before, especially with regards to the conditions of his deportation and his monthly allowance, the state regalia were checked and inventoried by four Banjarese *mantries* and received by Müller and Walbeecken. After this visit the regalia were stored in the Resident's office.²⁹ The sultanate was placed under the temporary government of two princes. Although Tamdjidillah and the Dutch had agreed to install a new sultan after the revolt had ended the Dutch also hinted at the return of Hidayatullah as a new sultan, something that would have been unacceptable for Sultan Tamdjidillah. However, in the course of 1859-1860 Hidayatullah continued to refuse to return from his place in hiding. With no solution in sight and little confidence that a newly appointed sultan would end the revolt, the Netherlands-Indies Government announced on 11 June 1860 to dissolve the sultanate and install a system of direct governance.³⁰ On that same day, the Gouvernements Commissaris sent a letter to the Gouverneur Generaal announcing

²⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of minutes of 24 June 1859: "(...) uit eigen vrijen wil (...)".

²⁵ Sjamsuddin, "Fighting Dutch Rule", 112; NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 52, 'Resumé der korrespondentie omtrent de aangelegenheden van het Martapoerasche hof', secret letter of 23 February 1858 no. 228 from the Resident to the Gouverneur Generaal, 246.

²⁶ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of minutes of 24 June 1859: "Dat hij zich ook nu geheel onderwerpt aan den raad van de Gouvernements Commissaris (...)".

²⁷ Ibidem, copy of a translation of the public announcement of Tamdjidillah of 25 June 1859: "(...) uit eigen vrijen wil en zonder eenigen dwang (...)".

²⁸ For instance: "Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861," 122; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, verbaal 10 March 1862, no. 6, minutes of Siedenburg of 14 December 1861: "Proces Verbaal van Afpakking".

²⁹ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 869, verbaal 16 September 1859 no. 29, copy of a letter of the Resident to the Gouvernements Commissaris of 26 June 1859.

³⁰ *Surat-Surat perdjandjian antara kesultanan Banjarmasin dengan pemerintahan-pemerintahan VOC, Bataafse Republiek, Ingeris dan Hindia-Belanda, 1635-1860* (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 1965), 264-267.

to send the regalia to the Gouverneur Generaal “because a longer retention [in Banjarmasin] was pointless.” All the regalia would be at the disposal of the Gouverneur Generaal, except the diamond “for which authorisation was requested.” It is not clear what this authorisation implied and who decided that the diamond deserved an alternative treatment, but it is the first time that the diamond was explicitly mentioned as part of the surrendered state regalia and singled out of the larger collection.³¹

We have no actual confirmation of the whereabouts of the diamond in the months after this moment, but when the diamond was boarded to be shipped to the Netherlands, this happened in presence of two officials of the *Directie der Producten en Civiele Magazijnen* [Office of products and civil warehouses].³² This was the depot in Batavia from where all colonial goods and products were transported to the Netherlands or brought to the world market. It is likely that the diamond was temporarily stored by this institution.³³

Two years after the surrender of the Banjarmasin regalia by Tamdjidillah, and one year after their transportation to Batavia, the larger collection was offered to the Bataviaasch Genootschap, which gratefully accepted the donation.³⁴ However, for reasons yet unknown, the 70 carat diamond was again explicitly excluded from the rest of the collection.³⁵ On 26 November 1861 Gouverneur Generaal Sloet (1806-1890) suggested to the Minister of Colonies to give the diamond to Dutch King William III (1817-1890), and to this end, on 16 December 1861, the diamond departed from the harbour of Batavia.³⁶ The diamond was transported with war steamer *Ardjoeno*, which was the same ship that transported Kolonel Andresen and 150 men to Banjarmasin to quell the revolt, and that had exiled Tamdjidillah to Batavia.

History between 1862 and 1902

On 7 April 1862, at the department of the Ministry of Colonies in The Hague, the Dutch Minister of Colonies Uhlenbeck (1815-1888) unpacked the diamond from its “rotated yellow box,” which was made of boxwood. The diamond was wrapped in paper and cast in heavy silver thread. It was weighed upon departure in Batavia and arrival in The Hague, and both times it measured 70 carat.³⁷ More than four months had passed since the Gouverneur Generaal had announced he would send the diamond to the Netherlands. He asked the Minister of Colonies to consider offering the stone to King William III as a decoration to his royal crown.³⁸ Apparently the minister agreed to have the diamond sent to the

³¹ NL-HaNA, Nieuwenhuijzen, 2.21.205.44, inv.nr. 53, log of correspondence of Governor Commissioner Nieuwenhuijzen, note of an outbound letter of 11 June 1860, no. 176: “vermits een langere aanhouding zonder eenig nut is”. This source also rules out a rumour in *Bataviaasch Handelsblad* which speculated that Tamdjidillah probably took the ‘famous diamond of the Sultans of Martapura’ with him to Batavia, almost a month after his resignation in June 1859: “Koloniën,” *Rotterdamsche Courant*, October 18, 1859, 1.

³² NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, minutes of C. van Reijn and F.W.H. van Straaten, 14 December 1861.

³³ See also its involvement from 23 June 1860 onwards: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no. 2.

³⁴ “Bestuursvergadering 13 Julij 1861,” 122-125, 136-137, 219.

³⁵ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no.2.

³⁶ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, letter from the Gouverneur Generaal to the minister of colonies, 26 November 1861.

³⁷ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1173, 24 April 1862 no. 22, receipt note and verbaal 7 April 1862; *ibidem*, inv.nr. 1437, verbaal 9 February 1864, no. 28, concept minutes.

³⁸ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1158, 10 March 1862 no. 6, letter of the Gouverneur Generaal to the minister of colonies, 26 November 1861.

Netherlands, but was unsure whether the diamond could be donated to the king as a personal gift, or should instead remain property of state.³⁹ On 3 March 1862, while the diamond was on its way to Europe, this question was subject of debate in the Council of Ministers, which decided that it was most appropriate to have the diamond stored in the Museum van Natuurlijke Historie in Leiden as state property.⁴⁰ However, the museum director as well as the director of KKZ in The Hague objected, because they did not have the facilities to guard the diamond properly, and because the gem did not fit in their collections.⁴¹ As an alternative, the Minister of Colonies considered selling the diamond on the market, the revenue of which would be added to the *Batig Saldo*, the yearly sum that the Netherlands Indies had to transfer to the motherland. The Nederlandsche Handel-maatschappij (NHM), the Dutch trading company that had the monopoly to sell colonial products from the Indies to the world market, offered help, suggesting cutting the diamond before bringing it to the market.⁴² However, this time King William III objected against selling the diamond.⁴³ During these months of correspondence, the diamond remained where it had arrived on 7 April 1862: the department of the Ministry of Colonies in The Hague. Pending further decisions about the diamond's destination, the diamond was brought to Dutch national bank, De Nederlandsche Bank, on 22 February 1864 to be stored until further notice. The transfer happened in the presence of diamond broker E. Vita Israel (1831-1915), who examined the gem and determined its weight at 69 and 7/8 carat.⁴⁴

A few years later, in 1869, the Minister of Colonies again proposed the king to sell the diamond and this time the latter approved. The diamond was brought to the NHM on 8 October 1869 and priced 300.000 guilders. The minister and NHM agreed to remain silent about the selling party and the provenance of the object.⁴⁵ Moreover, the NHM advised to have the diamond cut, because "its deviating shape and lesser clarity" would scare off possible buyers.⁴⁶ Buyers were not willing to bear the risk of cutting and possibly ruining the diamond. On 6 May 1870, the minister decided to have the diamond cut by A.E. Daniëls and son, managing directors of the factory of M.M. Coster (1818-1880) in Paris.⁴⁷ The expense for cutting the diamond (2500 guilders) was deducted from the revenue of a 17-carat diamond from Banjarmasin that was sold in 1864.⁴⁸

³⁹ Cf. a debate on the fate of a 17-carat diamond from Banjarmasin which the Gouverneur Generaal suggested to sell to the benefit of veterans' home Bronbeek in the Netherlands: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1396, 20 October 1863 no. 55.

⁴⁰ NL-HaNA, Ministerraad, 2.02.05.02, inv.nr. 34, Minutes Council of Ministers, 3 March 1862.

⁴¹ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1272, 3 December 1862 no. 23, letter from the Minister of Internal Affairs to the Minister of Colonies.

⁴² NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1278, 22 December 1862 no. 17, letter from the NHM to the Minister of Colonies, 11 December 1862 no. 112 Secret.

⁴³ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 1403, Kabinetsrescript of 26 December 1862 no. 36; *Ibidem*, inv.nr. 1801, Kabinetsrescript 20 augustus 1869 no. 1, letter from the Minister of Colonies to the king, 12 August 1869 no. 36.

⁴⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 1441, verbaal 22 February 1864 no. 9, minutes of transfer between the Minister of Colonies and the DNB. See also *Handelingen der Eerste Kamer, 27^{ste} vergadering, 30 April 1897*, p. 384, interpellation of former Minister of Colonies Fransen van de Putte.

⁴⁵ NL-HaNA, Nederlandsche Handel-Maatschappij (NHM), 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 72, 8 October 1869.

⁴⁶ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 93, 20 December 1869: "(...) den afwijkenden vorm en van de verminderde zuiverheid (...)".

⁴⁷ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 428, minutes of the board meeting, nr. 93, 9 May 1870; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 6010, verbaal 6 mei 1870 E5.

⁴⁸ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 2374, verbaal 21 januari 1871 no. 18, letter of the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the minister of colonies, 7 January 1871.

From this moment on, the diamond was no longer 69 and 7/8 carat but was measured at 37 and 3/8 carat.⁴⁹ More importantly, after cutting the cutter had to admit that the it was not as bright as he had hoped and expected but showed a “yellowish tint” that negatively influenced its value.⁵⁰ The price was substantially lowered to 50.000 guilders, but no buyer was found. In 1875, the Minister of Colonies and NHM decided to cancel the sale and await better times. Now that the financial market value of the diamond seemed much lower than expected, according to the minister it no longer weighed up against the historical value of the stone “as a costly memorial of an important event in the history of the Netherlands Indies.”⁵¹

According to a newspaper report from 1883, the diamond was exhibited at the Internationale en Koloniale Uitvoerhandel-Tentoonstelling in Amsterdam, in the showcase of E. Vita Israël (1831-1915). For the occasion, he had borrowed the diamond from the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij.⁵²

In 1888 it was decided by the government that the diamond would be brought to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, but awaiting the construction of a special safety showcase the actual transfer was delayed and finally cancelled. The transfer was almost effectuated, but in the closing months of 1897 the Minister of Colonies proposed to put the diamond on sale for a third time, together with a collection of gems from the Lombok treasure. This time, the argument was used that the diamond had lost its historical value after it had been cut and had never been part of the actual Banjarmasin regalia.⁵³ To this end, the diamond was transferred from the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the Amsterdam diamond traders E. and J. Vita Israël, who had examined the diamond in 1864. He tried to auction the gemstone in March 1898. But again without success.⁵⁴ Finally, on 22 August 1902, the diamond was transferred from E. Vita Israel to the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, in permanent loan from the Minister of Colonies.⁵⁵

History since 1902

The diamond, probably because of permanent state of uncertainty concerning its fate, was never officially registered in the inventory of the museum. Between (at least) 1908⁵⁶ and 1918⁵⁷ it was put on display together with another hotly debated collection: the Lombok treasure that was looted from the palaces of the Lombok kingdom in 1894.⁵⁸

⁴⁹ NL-HaNA, NHM, 2.20.01, inv.nr. 6432, minutes of the NHM vault, 26 August 1870; According to a gemmological analysis of S. Van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, the diamond weighs 38.23 carat: S. van Leeuwen and J.C. Zwaan, “Banjarmasin diamond,” *The Journal of Gemmology* (forthcoming).

⁵⁰ NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 6013, letter of the Nederlandse Handel-maatschappij to the minister of colonies, 27 August 1870: “(...) een min of meer geelachtigen tint, die van nadeeligen invloed is op de waarde van het juweel.”

⁵¹ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 1801, Kabinetsrescript 20 August 1869 no. 1; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 2779, verbaal 21 April 1875 no. 19: “(...) een kostbaar gedenkteekeken van eene belangrijke gebeurtenis in de geschiedenis van N.I. (...)”

⁵² “De Diamantnijverheid op de tentoonstelling II,” *Nieuwe Amsterdamsche Courant, Algemeen Handelsblad*, May 9, 1883, 5. The author wants to thank Suzanne van Leeuwen for sharing this information.

⁵³ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 2833, Kabinetsrescript 12 April 1888 no. 27; NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.02, inv.nr. 5224, verbaal 2 December 1897 no. 22.

⁵⁴ NL-HaNA, Koloniën / Openbaar Verbaal, 2.10.36.04, inv.nr. 2.10.36.04, Inv.nr. 133, 19 Juli 1902 no. 35.

⁵⁵ NL-HaNA, KdK 1841-1897, 2.02.04, inv.nr. 5237, verbaal 19 July 1902, no. 35, minutes director RMA and broker Vita Israel, 22 August 1902; see also NL-HlMnHA, 476 Rijksmuseum en rechtsvoorgangers te Amsterdam, inv. nr. 1074.

⁵⁶ F. Leviticus, *Geïllustreerde Encyclopaedie der Diamantnijverheid* (Haarlem: De Erven F.Bohn, 1908), 245.

⁵⁷ “Wetenswaardigheden. De Lombokschat in het Rijksmuseum,” *Diamant-Handelsblad, officieel weekblad van de Vereeniging van Koopliden in Diamant* 21, 7 August 1918.

⁵⁸ Ewald Vanvugt, *De schatten van Lombok: Honderd jaar Nederlandse oorlogsbuit uit Indonesië* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Jan Mets, 1994).

Museum documentation from 1937 indicates that in that year the diamond was brought to a jeweller in Amsterdam, Bonebakker&Zn, probably for maintenance or taxation.⁵⁹ In 1984 the diamond was subject of historical archival research of a Rijksmuseum curator. Only in 2000 was the diamond registered, and in 2013, after a large renovation of the Rijksmuseum in Amsterdam, the Banjarmasin diamond was put on permanent display in a room dedicated to “the Netherlands overseas.”

Suggestions for further research

Archival research in Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia (ANRI) may provide additional documents stored in the archives of the Algemene Secretarie or the Residentie Zuid en Oosterafdeling van Borneo. These documents may shed light on the question why the Gouverneur Generaal selected the diamond, out of all other regalia, as a present to King William III. See for concrete references: NL-HaNA, Koloniën, 1850-1900, 2.10.30, inv.nr. 7319, Oost-Indische besluiten, 26 November 1861 no.2.

⁵⁹ Objectmap RMA NG-C-2000-3, copy of letter of the conservator of Rijksmuseum to A. Bonebakker, 25 May 1937; NL-AsdSAA, 406 Archief Bonebakker & Zn., inv.nr. 232, Debiteuren Journaalposten 1937, 20 May 1937.