

In the literature on the relationship *raja-bhagawanta* (also called *purohita*), it is depicted as if it were a relationship between a Puri and a certain Brahmana compound or its priest (e.g., Worsley 1979). In the Babad Buleleng Worsley discusses, he describes *purohita* as an attribute of kingship, characterizing him as the foremost of the king's jewels (*makagra cudamani*). In the Babad Buleleng, where the close relationship between the king and the clan of the Kemenuh Brahmana is depicted as a prerequisite of a kingdom in general, Worsley characterizes this relationship as "king and priest stood together like brothers in good fortune and bad, continually caring for each other" (1979:111; but see also Guermonprez 1985:53).

My investigations of temples as places where rituals are performed with the participation of princes and kings reveal a different result, which raises the question of the social origin of the scribes of the Babad Buleleng: in my opinion, the passages in question mirror the view of the priests, since the close dyadic relationship between king and priest, as maintained by Brahmana, implies (indirect) participation in the political power. As far as the Puri is concerned, however, there is definitely a different point of view. Members of the royal families I questioned about the king/priest relationship reacted with reluctance. It was said that a *raja* was free, since the term *bhagawanta* contains the concept of attachment and therefore also of dependence. He was said to choose a new *pedanda* for a specific ritual. This information appears to be correct in several respects; thus the Keniten and Mas Brahmana tell about their departure from Klungkung because of a lack of cooperation from the Dalem. On the other hand, I was able to observe – recently and therefore under altered exterior conditions – how the local and regional princes ordered *pedanda* from alternating *griya* to conduct a ritual.

In fact, no definite *bhagawanta* relationship can be proved for Abian Timbul and, to a lesser extent, for the Puri in Denpasar. This was no doubt different for the Sentong dynasty, since no other Brahmana compound existed and Gusti Kepandean had a specific Brahmana group come to Mimba. The subsequent rulers of Badung apparently engaged priests from different *griya* to lead the rituals (on varying socio-political levels). To heighten the meaning of the rituals, *pedanda* of various origin were (and are) often invited. This prevented a single *griya* from attaining ritual monopoly or political power (and possibly even rulership). Abian Timbul, at least, handled this very skillfully and promoted a variety of *griya*. It is also obvious that this enhanced the competition among the Brahmana compounds.

---

of her children, a boy, stole a *cangklong*, a pipe. There was a death penalty for such a theft, and the boy fled to Renon, which was under the rulership of Abian Timbul. Since the boy was Brahmana, he was ordered into the Jero Abian Timbul. When the Griya Sanur learned about this, it led to quarrels which could not be settled. The sovereign Abian Timbul went to the Griya Sanur to ask for mercy for the boy. It was agreed that once the boy had grown up, he was to receive land in Intaran to build a Brahmana compound there. The boy was then to become *pedanda* and act as such in Intaran – i.e., to receive 'clients' as well. Thus the Griya Puseh was created.