

A Comparative Study of Royal Marriages under the Tributary-Suzerainty and Feudal Orders: Taking Qutlugh Kelmish's Marriage to Goryeo and Maximilian I's Marriage to Burgundy as Examples

Rui Xu^{1*}

Department of world history, Tianjin Normal University, Tianjin, 300387, China
Email: xr@stu.tjnu.edu.cn

Abstract:

In the tributary-suzerainty order of East Asia, Yuan-Goryeo's royal marriage was carried out based on tribute dependence. The beginning and end of the marriage are based on the need for Mongol-Yuan dynasty indirect management, which will further consolidate the tribute system and deepen the subordinate relationship between both sides. Marriage also was a way to do political oversight, indirect governance, and cultural spreading, showing that there wasn't much room for self in a hierarchical order. The Habsburgs' marriage to Burgundy in the European feudal order is based on the power of the feudal system. Focused on interest bundling, power expansion, formed an interest group with close ties, promoting the unification of force in the region of Europe. Comparison between the two marriages can reveal the connection between civilization and order, which is also related to diplomacy; break the binary opposition of East/West civilizations; it could serve as an important reference for cross-cultural diplomatic history research.

Keywords: Tributary-suzerainty order; feudal order; royal marriage; Yuan-Goryeo marriage; Habsburg-Burgundy marriage.

1. Introduction

Before the modern age, dynastic states were the main players in international affairs. Royal intermarriage, which is typical for flexible diplomacy has been rooted in the creation and change of pre-modern world

order. From the hierarchical centre-periphery structure of the East Asian suzerain-vassal system to the more decentralised power distribution of the feudal order in Western Europe; dynasty marriages were not simply used for continuity of the royal line. And it was an important tie in passing along the govern-

ment's intent and power across different areas. Its practical form was always bound up with the order core of particular civilizations.

There is a considerable body of scholarship regarding royal intermarriage that focuses on East Asia or Europe: But there are great deficiencies for cross-civilizational comparison. Studying about the marriage between Yuan-Goryeo dynasties in East Asia, Chinese scholars have given two different views. One is about the dominant power of the suzerain country; one shows the subjectivity of the vassal state. Wuyun Gaowa focuses mainly on the activities of Princess Qutlugh Kelmish. She states that the dynasty's marriages were used by the Yuan Dynasty as a method of having great influence in politics with Goryeo [1, 2]. But Sun Hongmei is different because she focuses on King Chungnyeol of Goryeo's journey to the Yuan court. She shows that Goryeo had little room for developing a political system as an imperial son-in-law [3]: Regarding the East Asian tributary system research by foreign scholars, it is mostly based on J King Farnak's influence-responses perspective of view [4] Like take a paper by hamashitas on the tributary system and trading spheres structure [5]. Neither does the former use royal intermarriage as a main case to study the embodiment of international order;

The literature related to the marriage between the Habsburgs and the Duchy of Burgundies is very different. Sheng also calls it an union which is the Habsburg's method for territory, they would rather use diplomacy than fight [6] And, also Benel, Coopu it used the Network approach that looks at Balancing act display on Royal Marriages [7]. International studies of Western European feudalism have been done by Susan Reynolds. Reynolds in Fiefs and vassal's states that Lord-Vassal relationship is a bilateral contract [8]. Prak Maarten studies the connection between feudal marriage and European commercial network. And it has also not made cross-civilizational, order-centered comparisons of this European marriage with its East Asian counterparts [9].

In terms of cross-civilization comparisons, Cui Mingde has examined the global aspects of Peace-Marriage culture. He is not interested in different kinds of marriages under two representative pre-modern orders: Much of the international research still gets stuck between the two civilizations, East vs West. These do not take into account the central argument that what is inside matters for diplomatic practice [10].

On the backdrop above, the main perspectives of analysis in this paper are hierarchy ethics and contractual spirit. It takes the Yuan-Goryeo Marriage and the Habsburg-Burgundy Marriage for examples. Paper points out that there were some fundamental differences regarding origin, operation and power and also historical consequence. It

shows how international order makes dynastic marriages into what they are. Also sum up general historical pattern of pre-modern royal inter-marriage.

This comparison is not on the basis of chronological simultaneity. It is instead the result of the isomorphically of international order dominated by dynastic states in the pre-modern world. Both were confronted with the problem of adjusting power and maintaining order. This is common ground, this provides the basis for comparative civilization

This paper looks at royal intermarriage with regards to the Suzerain-Vassal Order and Western European Feudal Order: It explains variations in marriage by means of the internal foundations of political order. In doing so it breaks down the binary opposition between Eastern and Western framework. It emphasizes on the subjectivity being limited when the vassal state and feudal are studied further about how pre-modern international orders transformed.

2. The Core of Order: Hierarchical Ethics and Contractual Spirit

As defined in this study, the suzerain-vassal order (SVO) constitutes the political core of the East Asian tributary system. It refers specifically to the hierarchical and dependent relationship between a central plains dynasty and its neighboring vassal states. This relationship is maintained through enfeoffment, tributary missions and royal intermarriage. The tributary system itself is a composite structure that integrates political, economic and cultural dimensions. The European feudal order (EFO) emerged from Germanic military traditions and the fief system. It is centered on the bilateral contract between lords and vassals. It differs fundamentally from the feudal systems of pre-Qin China and the centralized feudalism established after the Qin and Han dynasties. It does not represent a simple hierarchical enfeoffment. It functions instead as a system of interest balancing under decentralized power.

The running of any sort of political order is dependent on certain ethical values and power standards. Pre-modern East Asian suzerain-vassal order and the feudal system in Western Europe had their own internal logic. These are the result of different civilizational paths and social organizations. The east-asian model is characterized with patriarchy, hierarchy and ethics, and the european model is shaped up through feudal contract. There are differences in terms of sources of political legitimacy, power relationships are formed and different people get different responsibilities. These divisions created different kinds of operations: And they also become the main analytical frame to understand different practices of royal marriage

east and west.

The hierarchy ethics in East Asian suzerain-vassal order get their spiritual foundation from the patriarchal idea in Confucianism. And they are institutionally unified in the autocratic monarchy. It is a continuation and transformation of the patriarchal and family-based political system of the pre-Qin period. Qin abolished the feudal system and set up commanderies and counties. And thus, it set up the imperial throne's supreme authority above all land and people. There was a vertical hierarchy like monarch-official-registered commoner. Its central ethical rule is to have the ruler guide the minister. Unilateral obedience and domination is the fundamental rule of power interplay [11]. This ethical frame is very one-sided hierarchy. The main body has no doubt over the periphery. The monarch has full control over the lives and properties of their people. Officials are only tools for the emperor's rule. Only registered commoners have obligations like labor service or land tax. There is no legal way to resist superiors. There could be superficial exchanges of interest. Such exchange is initiated and dominated by the most powerful of all at the very top. Hierarchical ethics is upheld by the combined effect of ritual morality and the coercion of autocratic power. This is the immovable bedrock on which stands the East Asian suzerain-vassal order. And it will determine the unilateral bond characteristic of East Asian diplomatic practices. And it formed the oppressive and dependant nature of the marriage between yuangoxo.

The contractual spirit of the European feudal order was a natural consequence of the dispersed nature of power in Europe. Europe's public authority fell apart after barbarian attacks: The manor became the economic and political basis of social life. Kings were on their own lands. Their power could not reach every independent territory. So a decentralized power centered around lords and their vassals was formed [11]. The establishment of such structure has not been dominated unilaterally by the father. But it was based on non-kinship interest computations and voluntary associations. Lords and vassals formed a simple contract which is constrained by both. The lord gave land and military defense to the vassal. The vassal did military service, giving advice and supplies back. The rights and duties of both sides were spelled out. Either could have ended the dependent relationship or resisted legally had the other broken the deal.

This contractualism spread to many power relationships within European society. Spiritual authority and secular power existed in a sort of contract that constantly negotiated. Both the landlords and tenants had certain rights and duties under custom. Monarchs and up-and-coming city folk drew up lines of authority with deals. Contractual spirit is the key, and it doesn't rest on complete equality

of status. Shows the constraint relationship between both sides of power. Exchange Right and Obligation It is in stark contrast with the one-sided domination under East Asian hierarchical morality. And it will decide on the bilateral bargaining nature of European diplomacy. And this logic explains why that Habsburg-Burgundy marriage was so win-alliance.

The hierarchy ethics of East Asia and the contract spirit of Europe aren't just about equal vs unequal. These are the basic differences in operation between a pre-modern eastern and western political system. In East Asia hierarchical ethics is unilateral imperial domination. It regards obedience as an essential ethical standard for every level of society. The stability of the order relies upon how strong the middle power is. Europeans' contract spirit is bilateral balance of right and obligation with decentralized power. Contract is treated as the basic rule for power exchange. The order is stable because several players are in the interest game.

These two very different order cores have formed the operation of Eastern and Western politics. They have also profoundly shaped the forms of pre-modern political behavior among different civilizations. They are the main historical origins of different practices concerning royal marriage.

3. The Core of the East Asian Tributary-Suzerainty Order and the Practice of Yuan-Goryeo Royal Marriage

The East Asian suzerain-vassal order was embedded in the tradition of central plains dynastic unifications and Confucian hierarchical ethics. It put an absolute central plains dynasty right there. Neighboring vassals were subordinated to the central court by way of ritual missions, enfeoffment and hostage exchange. Central plain dynasties legitimized local leaders through decree and gifts of the emperor. There is a fixed center-periphery structure: Power distribution, ritual rules and resources flow all followed the order from top to bottom. And so, it made a usual, one-sided binding international order.

After the rise of the Mongol-Yuan, the empire regime took over the basic framework of the traditional suzerain-vassal order. And it also controlled the vassal states more, and made them formally belong to his regime. Mongol had already forced Goryeo into submission with 6 big military battles. The Third Campaign in 1235 was when they took cities like Yonggang, Hamjong, and Sandeng. They systematically plundered all over the north of the peninsula. After Goryeo withdrew to Ganghwa Island, the Mongol army still raided the coast. And social and economic de-

struction went together with a large fall in numbers. Just military suppression, just direct rule had high cost for governance. They also constantly provoked resistance from the Goryeo government.

According to Records of Yuan and Goryeo, it says: The prime minister An Tong got a letter written by General Touniege on the 20th day of the seventh month in the seventh year of Zhiyuan. The message said that general Ahai stationed 1,500 troops at the royal capital to look into things. Ahai was subsequently appointed as pacification commissioner. On the 25th day of the 11th month, the Secretariat petitioned for the creation of a Military Colonization and Management Office in Goryeo. Xindu and Shi Shu were made Military Commissioners in Fengzhou. They led five thousand soldiers to farm in Geumju. Hong Chaqiu was ordered to settle 2,000 current families into the farming villages [12]. Alatur was a vice comm and he supervised everything. The troops from Ahai were then disbanded. Goryeo people were still resisting even if the Military Garrison was placed and Agricultural Colonization by the Yuan-Mongol court. In 1270 The Sambyeolcho's force had risen to the call of fighting against the mongols and bring back the state. They took over in Jin Island, Jeju Island and fought for almost 2 years. So, the Mongol -Yuan court found out that military power couldn't bring about long-term peace.

To change the superior subordinate relation into not using army alone, instead the mongol - yuan government did so. It adopted royal marriage as an elastic pacification means. It used kinship ties to cut down on the chance of rebellion and strengthen hierarchy. This was an obvious suzerain-led marriage project right from the start. It became an ordinary way of indirect rule under such a suzerain-vassal relationship. The Mongol-Yuan Court repeatedly intermarried Imperial Princesses with the Goryeo Royal Family from Mid-13th Century to Early 14th Century. These unions were far more than mere family ties. They played important parts in bringing about the suzerain-vassal order. Mongol-Yuan court used princess marriage to make Goryeo's royal power be deeply integrated into political system. Goryeo which was in the lopsided power structure, used those ties to keep its life going and seek some limited development room. And the result was an uncle-nephew alliance: a kind of control far away, in the style of suzerain-vassal. It showed the humble and submissive posture of a vassal state.

The first royal marriage between the Yuan and Goryeo was concluded in 1274. This was when they formally established their suzerain-vassal ties. Goryeo had suffered great national decline after 6 invasions. When the powerful minister, Im Yeon, dethroned king Wonjong and made Prince Gyeong the new ruler it brought about an internal

political crisis. Meanwhile, the Mongol-Yuan court had its sights set on subjugating the Southern Song. It desperately wanted to stabilize the eastern vassal and remove rear troubles. Also, it wanted to use Goryeo as the stepping stone for an invasion of Japan. Shared political demands made for a marriage [13]. Kublai Khan betrothed his 16 - year - old legitimate daughter Qutlugh Kelmish to the Goryeo crown prince Wang Gam. Wang Gam took throne with name King Chungnyeol on the 6th month of the same year. A custom arose of the Goryeo kings marrying Yuan imperial princesses one after another.

Princess Qutlugh Kelmish after marrying into the Goryeo Dynasty was no ordinary royal wife, She was like a political supervisor sent out from the Yuan dynasty. She was greater than the rest of the members of the Goryeo dynasty. She had her own palace, also her own government office and a guard team. She can even interfere with state affairs.

In 1278, Princess went to see Kublai Khan with King Chongnyeol. They report the difficult time in Goryeo. The commander Xindu and Hong Chaqiu from the Yuan colonial troops tortured Goryeo officials in order to investigate a false accusation against Jin Banggyeong. They tried to meddle in internal governance. The princess and the king wrote together a letter saying that the two commanders used too much power. And Kublai Khan ordered for the colonial troops to withdraw from Goryeo and dismiss the local darughachi. The Goryeo administration and military pressure was relieved [7].

Territorial dispute, In 1289 the princess once more accompanied her father to the yuan at kharkhun. She wanted to abolish the Dongning Prefecturer that was made by the Mongols. Seogyeong was more than 50 northern cities that were seized for more than 20 years and returned to the Goryeo. In 1294, she was successful in persuading the khan to return Jeju. Direct Mongol rule over the island ceased. Goryeo regaining the main territory.

He depended on his position as an emperor's daughter to go to the Yuan court 19 times throughout his rule. Kublai Khan treated him very well, sending an imperial prince called Togun to greet him thirty li away, and holding a grand banquet in a huge yurt. Goryeo's king obtained some level of administrative and financial autonomy due to political support from the Mongol-Yuan court. And so Goryeo was one of only a few semi-independent regimes under the Mongol-Yuan vassal system [3].

Princess and her companions' Mongol customs have slowly seeped into Goryeo's society because of certain events. In 1275 when Princess gave birth to a boy in the Sabang Palace she was following Mongol custom of bire with her entourage. They had all Goryeo officials arriving to congratulate her remove their belts and clothes before going

in. It is meant to drive away the evil and ask for blessing. This custom was later adopted in royal childbirth ceremonies in Goryeo [14].

The history of goryeo states that king wonjong went to the northwest to meet with the princess in the 10th month during the 15 years of his reign. Several Princes and High-Ranking Officials Accompanied Him. King scolded Li Fenxi and others because they did not shave their heads like mongols do. The officials said it was not what they disliked but they were waiting to see the general practice. The Mongol custom was shaving off all hair from the crown till the forehead leaving only some hair at center. It's called a style of KeChuR. And the king had such a hairstyle when he went to the Yuan dynasty. The most of the people haven't. He thus rebuked the officials. Ordering Li Fenxi to go back to the capital and tell all the imperial concubines, princesses and noble women to go out and meet the princess. The king left the crowd at Longquan station. And he only used generals who had adopted the Mongol hairstyle [14].

In 1274 when he welcomed the princess, King Chongnyeol also criticized people like Li Fenxi. He said they were disrespectful to the customs of the superior state, why don't you have Mongol kechur hairstyles? Everyone had no choice but to do so. Mongol clothes and hair then reached out to Goryeo court and the upper class.

The princess liked hunting, she would hunt every day with the king. And thus, the Mongol falconry system was founded in Goryeo. King in his later time, fell for hawking and forgot about state affairs. And the princess and crown prince Wang Jang remonstrate with him. This is an example of Mongol customs influencing royal politics during the Goryeo period [2].

From an economic standpoint, The Princess went and got Ginseng & Pine Nuts from NE Goryeo in 1276. These goods will be taken to the Jiangnan area for sales and have huge profits. Then it was practiced on a larger scale. Eunuchs went out to gather up goods even from places where no such things grew. This activity became one of special linkages in exchanges of the suzerain and vassal economically.

The marriage between Yuan-Goryeo was like a superior country offering their daughter (princess) to the inferior country and that inferior country accepts the royal consort. And nearly no females of Goryeo royal family had marriage relations with the Yuan. Goryeo was mostly passive through it all. It had very little room to pick and negotiate. Its political agency largely remained within what was permitted by the suzerain- vassal order. This power imbalance continued into the marriage arrangements. In the Goryeo dynasty, Crown Princes had to be hostage in the Yuan court. King Chungseon, Wang Jang entered the Yuan

dynasty court when they were young as a tulqa. He was in the palace guards, he learned from the mongols. Goryeo's military and political affairs had to be approved by the Yuan court. The second time the Mongols invaded Japan in 1281, they made the Mongol-Yuan court order Goryeo to construct 900 ships and conscript over 17,000 sailors and rowers. Goryeo was bullied but still had no choice. The fact that this is such a mandatory vassal obligation [3]. In the suzerain-vassal order, the main purpose of the marriage between Yuan-Goryeo was to reinforce hierarchy and stabilize the region. It did not aim at equal interest-sharing. The whole business was just about cementing their own power by the Mongol Yuan court: Goryeo's political, economic and foreign autonomy was greatly reduced. Although Goryeo regained some territories and was granted limited autonomy by the princess, it could never be independent. In the late Yuan during the Zhizheng reign, central authority fell apart. The Red Turban uprisings swept over the middle plains. The court of the Yuan dynasty could no longer control Goryeo. In 1356, King Gongmin of Goryeo eliminated the office of Pacification Commissioner for the Eastern Expedition Province. He stopped sending tribute to the Yuan court. The marriage control system of the suzerain-vassal order fell apart. The end of the Goryeo's subordinate relationship. This is an obvious demonstration of the operation and history behind unilateral marriage under the suzerain-vassal order.

4. The Characteristics of the European Feudal Order and the Practice of Habsburg-Burgundy Royal Marriage

The European feudal order was the main international system on pre-modern continental Europe. It was based on Germanic military customs and the holding of fiefs. And its main feature was equality of contract, fragmentation and polycenter, power negotiations. This order has no power of a unified Empire. Duchies, counties and dynasties existed in a disperse but balanced state. The bonds between lord and vassal as well as dynasty were centered around the contract. Rights and duties were set out in writing. It followed the customs of interest complementation, negotiating compromises. The same restraint for both was the core logic in diplomacy [9].

Europe was in the height of feudalism in 15th C. Power competition and political integration became the mainstream. The relation between the Habsburg dynasty and the Duchy of Burgundy was an example. The Habsburgs took hold of important parts of Central Europe through military campaigns and marriages, like getting control of Austria and Tyrol. They controlled the political and mil-

itary power. However, they were left scattered and their commerce and industry was weak. There was an imbalance between its economic base and the political-military one. Dynasty needed a lot of good economic resources to stay in power.

Burgundy became an economic center of Europe. It depended on the thriving wool textile industry, banking networks and foreign trade links between the North Sea and Atlantic Ocean. Cities like Antwerp, Bruges were centers of cross-regional trade and made a lot of money. Duchy had very poor defensive situation. And it was in the western European plain with no defense depth. It was continuously pressed militarily by the kingdom of France. King Louis XI went for an acquisition of territory. In 1463, he allied himself with the Swiss Confederacy so as to encircle Burgundy. In 1475, he broke Burgundy's ties with England. The duchy found it hard to get its life and business [6].

And the two became a lopsided but useful couple. No suzerain-vassal hierarchy separated them. It was based entirely on shared interests. On January 1477 Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy engages in battle against an alliance of the Swiss Confederacy and French forces at Nancy. His heavy cavalry got trounced by Swiss pikemen. The duke died in battle, so there's no one left holding all that power. King Louis XI took the chance to take over central Burgundy. He marched to the Low Countries and incited cities into rebellion. Duchy's politics, economy came to the brink of collapse.

In that situation, Mary, daughter of the late duke, tried to save her land and power. She sent messengers to make contact with the Habsburgs. Maximilian I of Habsburg was in a great hurry for a matrimonial alliance to get money. The two soon came to an arrangement. On August 1477, Mary and Maximilian I signed the Marriage Treaty of Mary. Pact was formally set for their union. Negotiation was carried out fairly with no coercion. Clauses fully embodied the spirit of feudal contractualism. Agreement marked the classic model of power integration in the European feudal order [15].

The Habsburg-Burgundy marriage worked from the start with a contractual basis and had specific rights that both had. It was very different from the one-sided control of the suzerain-vassal system. The marriage treaty of Mary contains certain mutual promises. Habsburgs are going to maintain an army for fighting off French invasions. And they'd defend Burgundian territory, and make sure trade was possible in the low countries. Maximilian, I had promised to recognize the urban liberties and commerce in the Low Countries. Burgundy passed control over the important Low Countries parts to the Habsburgs. These regions were Flanders and Brabant. Burgundy also got

sea power in the North Sea. It gave the Habsburgs a firm source of money and some industry.

After the marriage, both parties fulfilled their responsibilities quickly. August 1479, Maximilian I led the troops to fight against the French Army at the Battle of Guinegate. Habsburg heavy cavalry and mercenary cavalry from the Low Countries fought together. They defeated the army of Louis XI. Campaign to stop French invading of the low country and get border back The Habsburgs kept the military protective vow. In 1478, she got the state general of the low countries to do something. The Habsburgs became part of the legitimate line of succession for the Burgundian lands. And urban-tax-self-governing, to preserve the defense cities are keeping back from being judged.

The marriage was based on equal negotiation. It had no provisions for political oversight or hostage-taking. It is to establish an alliance based on interest instead of forcing it. Mary died suddenly of a riding accident in 1482. Nobles in the Low Countries rebelled against Habsburg rule. They were afraid that Maximilian I would centralize power. Two side didn't adopt military suppression. They negotiated to resolve it, and signed the Treaty of Bruges. Maximilian, I recognised the legislative and tax-approving powers of the States General. He promised not to divert local resources from expansion in the Habsburg heartland. Nobles in the Low Countries accepted his regency. And they would help him rule over the lands with his young son Philip. Settlement completely showed up the two-sided fetters nature of feudal contract [6].

Kinship was just a feeling of affection. If Maximilian I had wanted to use financial or military resources from the Low Countries, he would have needed permission from the States General. It was very different from the one-sided obedience expected of vassals under the suzerain-vassal order. Marriage also resulted in thorough integration of economic, commercial regulation on both sides. And in 1482 they made a deal. The Treaty of Arras Habsburg lands had no tariff barriers with the Low Countries. North Sea and Rhine region's trade rules and currency exchange standard were made uniform. And it enabled wool textiles from the Low Countries to get into Central European markets duty-free. Grain and minerals from Habsburg lands were allowed into cities in the Low Countries.

Antwerp became the most important commercial and financial centre in sixteenth -century Europe. It attracted merchants from Italy, Germany and England. Annual banking transaction exceed ten million florins. And it has become an important node for cross-regional trade finance. Under the framework of the European feudal system, it was just a reasonable marriage among the feudal power. It was based on complementary interests. Its main function was to merge different powers and benefit from

them all together. Habsburgs used the money from industries and banks of low countries as a basis for expanding. In 1519, Charles V of the Habsburg lineage beat up rivals like King Francis I of France. He became Holy Roman Emperor thanks to huge electoral bribes from Low Countries bankers. He erected a huge supranational power bloc in Europe. Burgundy's survival crisis was resolved by the Habsburg army. The Low Countries were politically stable and commercially prosperous. In the early 15th century, more than 100 thousand cloths were produced by the wool textiles. It was a third of the whole of Europe: The Low Countries even had quite some autonomy as a Habsburg associated territory despite their continental heartland having been annexed by France forever. It's economic interest, its political privilege was all guaranteed.

The two parties formed a firm alliance with kinship and contract. They changed the feudal balance of power in Europe. Habsburg Empire went into Spanish and Austrian branches in 1556. Marriage set up commercial networks and established institutional rules that lasted for years. The trade ties with the Low Countries and Spain persisted until the Dutch war of independence in the 17th century. Austria had economic cooperation with the Low Countries until the end of the eighteenth century. In Battle of Guinegate, Treaty of Bruges, as well as in commercial regulation, this marriage showed the long term vitality of advantageous marriage within the European feudal system. It was a typical case of pre-Modern European Power Integration and Interest-Based Bargaining [6]

5. Comparative Analysis: A Systematic Comparison of the Two Logics

Yuan-Goryeo marriage and Habsburg-Burgundy Marriage are both typical examples of royal marriages in accordance with two traditional International Orders. They were the East Asian suzerain-vassal system and the European feudal system. The two unions employ kinship by means of dynasties. They have a common objective, to protect regime interests and maintain regional order. But they still have fundamental differences in history. This is because there is different internal logic to those orders that were nested within. Such differences are more than just superficial varieties of civilization. It's the result of big structural differences in power, ethics and operation.

The two marriages have very different beginnings and who does the starting. Yuan-Goryeo marriage is not mutual, it's a unilateral pacification policy made by the suture from above toward vassal. Mongol-Yuan Empire carried out union to solidify hierarchical rule and curb the power of its vassal. Goryeo was passive the whole time. It had

no room for independent choices and negotiations. This marriage's main job was to make the boss-employee arrangement more solid. It was never intended to work out together [6]. Habsburg-Burgundy marriage became a kind of equal, negotiated alliance between two powers within the feudal system. Both parties voluntarily signed this contract because they wanted what the other hand, which was related to their lives. From the start, it was founded on equal negotiation. It is seeking resources, It is building shared interests.

The two marriages were governed by very different institutional frameworks and binding logics. Yuan-Goryeo marriage is deeply rooted in the ritual system of the sizeren-vassal order. It was very close to hostage obligations, politics supervision and tributaries. They make a circle of controls altogether: Mongol- Yuan Empire kept the exclusive leading all along. Rulz was set and unchangeable. The power ran only one way. Kinship was used as a way of strengthening the suzerain's rule. Habsburg – Burgundy Marriage was based on the contract spirit of European feudalism. There was a formal marriage treaty which stated what each person had to do. Rules put mutual constraints and got mutual benefits. It was a bond of kinship which strengthened the contract alliance. A contract plus a negotiation model came about [11].

The two marriages were built on very different structures of power. Yuan-Goryeo Marriage was about a one-way subordinated relationship in the superior-subordinate order. Mongol-Yuan empire held all the authority and made the last decision. And it was still under control, Goryeo. Power difference was already beyond repair, there's nothing to negotiate. The hierarchy defined how that was related. Habsburg-Burgundy marriage had been placed in a bilateral power struggle under the feudal system. Each had their own core competence. No one was supreme by themselves. Power equilibrium was reached by negotiation and restraint. Difference was in some places only. Both had lots of room for strategy bargaining.

In terms of political function and results, it is even more obvious. Yuan-Goryeo marriage became an instrument of order control for the suzerain. It was meant to strengthen indirect rule and keep the empire's center spot. Though it is now a more stable suzerain-vassal relationship and they restrict themselves. It survived thanks to the Mongol-Yuan power. It fell rapidly when the empire went down [3, 13]. Habsburg-Burgundy marriages worked like a vehicle to get orders that helped out both people. It tried to make friends, solve crisis and enlarge its territory. It was instrumental to both sides' development: After even the political bonds had snapped, economic and institutional accomplishments based on contract and interest remained. It showed this kind of arrangement has very strong resil-

ience.

A comparison of history in both marriages can be drawn. Royal intermarriage isn't ever just one family's business. It is the materialization of an international order. Hierarchical ethics and unilateral controlling of the suzerain-vassal order shaped the subordinate and limited characteristics of the marriage between the Yuan-Goryeo. Contractual spirit and polycentric negotiation that was created by feudal order helped form the alliance- and benefit-based marriage between Habsburg-Burgundy. Together, the two are basic models of pre-Modern Cross-civilization Royal Marriage. And they show that international order strongly shapes and confines the ways diplomacy is done.

6. Conclusion

Taking the Yuan-Goryeo marriage and the Habsburg-Burgundy marriage as central case studies, this paper employs cross-civilizational comparative analysis. It systematically demonstrates the core proposition that royal intermarriage served as a materialized expression of pre-modern political order.

The East Asian tributary-enfeoffment system and the Western European feudal system were structured around distinct foundational norms. The former was defined by hierarchical ethics, while the latter was guided by contractual spirit. Differences in power logic and interactional rules between the two systems produced sharply divergent forms of royal marriage. The former became a political tool used by central empires to exercise indirect control over vassal polities. The latter served as an important mechanism for forming interest-based alliances among competing political entities within the feudal framework. This cross-civilizational comparison also brings to light different operation logic of political behavior amid different pre-modern order in the East and West.

Yuan-Goryeo Marriage History Records show that the Goryeo royal family is not completely passive and subordinate. King Chungnyeol went on big government trips to the Yuan court 7 times. This is clearly his own attempt at domestic matters.

But every sort of politics was kept inside limits fixed by the system that made dependent negotiation possible.

In the Habsburg-Burgundy alliance, too, equality was relative. Maximilian I constantly sought more centralization of power. After 1482, there were a number of quarrels with the nobles in the low countries too. These development shows clearly the conflicts of power bargaining in the western european feudal system.

History, which is the whole of things, contains lots of variables. This paper does ideal-typical analysis on the two-marriage model. To offer a point of view in terms of

understanding this connection between pre-modern political order and marital diplomacy. Doesn't try to make it all simpler or better.

Finally, comparing the two cases of Yuan-Goryeo and Habsburg-Burgundy Marriage Model we can confirm an important lesson. Before modern times, royal marriage wasn't just some wedding party. It was more like a real manifestation of power interplay in the current international order.

And it's form and direction was always determined by this logic of that order.

To grasp the various nature of eastern and western royal marriage in pre-modern era, we need to change our framework. Scholars cannot rely on civilization essentialism. They ought to turn on particular background. And they have to analyze the complicated interaction between order, power, and political action.

References

- [1] Wuyun Gaowa. Political marriage and cultural exchanges between Goryeo and the Yuan Dynasty. *Journal of Jinan University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2016, 38(10): 112-120.
- [2] Wuyun Gaowa. Yuan Dynasty princess Qutlugh Kelmish's marriage to Goryeo and its influence. *Journal of Inner Mongolia University for Nationalities (Social Sciences Edition)*, 2022, 48(5): 1-7.
- [3] Sun Hongmei. King Chungnyeol of Goryeo's visits to the Yuan court and Yuan-Goryeo relations. *Journal of Inner Mongolia University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 2012, 44(3): 5-9.
- [4] John King Fairbank. *The Chinese world order: Traditional China's foreign relations*. Trans. Du Jidong. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2010.
- [5] Takeshi Hamashita. *China, East Asia and the global economy: The tributary trade system and modern Asian economic circles*. Trans. Zhu Yingui, Ouyang Fei. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 1999.
- [6] Sheng Yun. The marriage policy of the Habsburgs and their hegemony. *Journal of Taizhou Teachers College (Social Sciences Edition)*, 1992(2): 107-110.
- [7] Benzell S. G., Cooke K. A network of thrones: Kinship and conflict in Europe, 1495-1918. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2021, 13(3): 102-133.
- [8] Reynolds S. *Fiefs and vassals: The medieval evidence reinterpreted*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- [9] Prak M., van Zanden J. L. *Pioneers of capitalism: The Netherlands 1000-1800*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2023.
- [10] Cui Mingde. The global significance of peace-making marriage culture and Sino-foreign comparisons. *Journal of*

World Peoples Studies, 2023(2): 1-12.

[11] Hou Jianxin. "Feudalism": A conceptual misplacement in world history. *Global History Review*, 2008: 336-348.

[12] *Annals of the Yuan Dynasty and Goryeo*. Xinbei: Guangwen Bookstore, 1972: 39.

[13] Li Jingli. A study of political relations between Goryeo and the Yuan Dynasty during the reign of King Chungnyeol. Yanji:

Yanbian University, 2019.

[14] Shiratori Kurakichi. Interpretation of Mongolian words in History of Goryeo. In: *Studies on Korean History*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1970: 460.

[15] Pierre Miguel. A history of France. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1980: 134.