

The root of *-rep-* found in the word in subreption registers as especially noteworthy, and should be associated (Random House, 2001, 1636) with words and images related to the Latin substantive *reptile* and the adjective *reptilis*. These words offer imagery suggesting: “to crawl along,” as certain reptiles are wont to do. *The Oxford Latin Dictionary* (1982, 1622) notes *repatatus* translates as “the act of creeping or crawling.” Research found in Charlton and Short [1879] (1958, 1573) suggests that the Latin adjective *reptilis* refers to “creeping.”

We can carry the associated imagery steps further by considering secondary meanings (Random House, 2001, 1897) for the word *reptilian* suggests “groveling, debased, or despicable and contemptible.” A third meaning for *reptilian* suggests “treacherous” and “harmful.”

Centuries later, and in Canon Law, the word subreption suggested (RH, 2001, 1895) “... a concealment of the pertinent facts in a petition, as for dispensation or favor, that in certain cases nullifies the grant.” In Scotts Law, subreption is associated with “obreption,” and with its first meaning noting: “The act of obtaining something, as an escheat by concealing pertinent facts.” In this appearance, the word *subreption* is rooted in the word: *rapere*, what connotes to seize or steal.

In his writings Immanuel Kant relies upon the term “*Erschleichung*.” This word has no clear relation to the Latin language, but is rooted in the Germanic infinitive: *zu schleichen* and this verb means “to crawl.” The noun (substantive) *Schleichung* means “crawl” or “crawling.” In standard English/German dictionaries, *Schleichung* tends to be equated with subreption as the most direct translation

With this inquiry I shall seek to address what I interpret as a challenge posed some decades earlier. In his article, “An Institutional Framework of Analysis,” William Dugger (1980, 901) asserts that “[s]ubreption is one of the least studied social phenomena of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.” In his application of the concept of subreption, Dugger (1980, 901) goes further, noting that *subreption* destroys “... the foundation of a pluralistic society... [replacing] institutional autonomy ... with institutional hegemony.”

Indeed, my search suggests a gap in the literature, for to date no author has either supported or challenged Dugger’s forceful assertion. For this inquiry I accept Dugger’s notion that *subreption* remains as understudied social phenomena, even in the second decade of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The purpose of our inquiry is to explore and clarify the appearances and uses of subreption, starting with Roman Law and later with Philosophy. And then I shall juxtapose the appearances and uses subreption in political economic inquiry, especially in the contributions of Thorstein Veblen and William Dugger.

### **Etymology of Subreption and Its Later Appearances and Uses**

Research of Zachary Sng (2010, 78-79) suggests subreption’s original appearance and uses can be found in Roman Law and “... as a judicial term describing the introduction of false evidence into a legal proceeding.” Further research suggests that subreption in Roman Law could be judged to occur if a contract were agreed upon, and with time the meaning of the contract changed, rendering the terms of contract irrelevant, even though the contract had to remain enforced. 1

==

==

Format for Page 0 in L.O.#3

Paper Title:

# *SUBREPTION AND ITS APPEARANCES AND USES IN LAW, PHILOSOPHY AND POLITICAL ECONOMY*

Authored by: John Smith

Professor of Economics, Penn State University (USA)

Submitted for consideration to:

*The Scottish Journal of Political Economy*

01 May 2018

**Abstract:** This inquiry responds to ideas advanced by William Dugger, and namely that as social phenomena, subreption should be considered as an especially important, but unfortunately neglected area of inquiry. In this sense our research seeks to fill a gap in the literature by clarifying the appearances and uses of subreption, initially in Roman Law, and then as *subreption* was later introduced into philosophical inquiry by Immanuel Kant. We then consider how the term's meaning was altered as it was later introduced into political economic inquiry in Thorstein Veblen's *The Higher Learning in America*. Finally, we consider how William Dugger relies upon his understanding of Veblen's use of subreption in order to consider and explain how corporations moved into hegemonic positions in recent decades. (123 words)

**JEL Classifications:** B15, B25, B31, B41

**Keywords:** Immanuel Kant, Erschleichung, subreption,  
Thorstein Veblen, William Dugger

That Thorstein Veblen provided a foundation for the field of Evolutionary Economics is supported by his original, scientific paper that was published in 1898 in the *American Economic Review*. “Why Is Economics Not an Evolutionary Science?” opened up our discipline by posing what then were several novel and challenging questions that have occupied the attention of those of us considering ourselves not only as followers, but also as exponents of his thought traditions. With the opening sentence of his first book, *The Theory of the Leisure Class* [1899] (Tilman, 1993, 5), Veblen introduces the notion that a “leisure class” could indeed be considered as an “institution”. Over time the meanings attached to this word and term contributed to the formation of the field of “Evolutionary-Institutional Economics”. With this inquiry what we seek to establish is that Veblen also provided a foundation for an evolutionary-institutional approach to “Feminist Economics”.

### **Veblen’s Insights**

Veblen’s efforts to advance a feminist economics have been considered. We can readily note that back in 1972 Edith Miller authored “Veblen and Women’s Lib: A Parallel”. In this article Miller (1972, 75-77) ....

## **LEARNING OPPORTUNITY #3**

### Marxist Political Economy

Learning Opportunity #3 involves improving upon what was developed in L.O. #2 as the first draft of your research paper. I hope that you devote full attention towards improving the development of your thesis with this second and final draft.

For this Learning Opportunity #3 we will consider that your Outline was handed in with L.O. #2. So for this L.O. #3 the cover page should be set to zero and then suppressed. On this cover page: include, Title, Your Name and EC345; and Abstract; *JEL* Classification Codes (about three) and up to five keywords.

This makes “Learning Opportunity #3 a fairly easy and sequential next step, and please keep in mind that L.O. #3 is potentially worth 25 points towards your final grade.

Please then refine your ideas based on your own good judgment, and also whatever else you might arrive at through and also independently of me. Your creative use of the various sentence structures should positively impress me, and also positively affect your grade for this assignment and also for your course grade. For sentence structures and style, please see the pages that came with your L.O.#1.

Check D2L for the file.

If all is working as schemed, then you will naturally process, synthesize, and further refine your ideas from your First Draft; that is then reworked and resubmitted as your Second and Final Draft. Please send me your L.O.#3 as an editable, (ideally as a WORD) file. Sent to me by Thursday of Exam Week, that is, by 5:00 p.m. on Thursday 11 June. Please be on time with your delivery as I have to consider and then send final grades up to the PSU Registrar.

Title pages is rendered page 0, then the 0 is suppressed. So the next page is page 1 of your paper.

# Thorstein Veblen as Evolutionary Feminist Economist of the Progressive Era

**Coauthored by:** John Smith and  
Ramon Sanders

Respectively, Department of Economics; Penn State  
University; Ohio, USA

and

Department of Economics, Federal University ABC; Sao Paulo,  
Brazil

**Forthcoming:** *Journal of Economic Issues*, June, 2020

**Abstract:** While Thorstein Veblen's efforts to advance an evolutionary-institutional economics have been considered by scholars over many decades, his effectiveness at advancing an institutional approach to feminist economics exhibits a shorter history. What distinguishes Veblen's contribution towards an evolutionary feminist perspective is that he relates the emergence of economic systems based upon private property to the Age of Savagery, and of women being taken captive through warfare. Instincts affecting behavior are viewed as relative constants, but which take on an evolutionary character when considered against what Veblen defines as four stages of social and economic development. (95 words)

**JEL Classification Codes:** B31, B52, B54

**Key Words:** Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Evolutionary Feminist  
Economics, Progressive Era, Thorstein Veblen