FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition
Fallacies of Relevance: Distraction Fallacies		Premises are logically irrelevant to the conclusion; arguer's premises seek to distract receiver from argument
Appeal to Emotions		Arguer seeks acceptance of a claim based on receivers' emotions
Appeal to Force (appeal to the "stick"; might makes right)	Argumentum ad Baculum	Arguer threatens/coerces receiver
Appeal to Fear (appeal to terror)	Argumentum ad Terrorem	Arguer terrorizes receiver; arguer makes receiver afraid of exaggerated consequences; arguer uses the threat of harm as evidence for a conclusion
Appeal to Hatred	Argumentum ad Edum	
Appeal to Pity (appeal for mercy; appeal for sympathy)	Argumentum ad Misericordiam	Arguer seeks acceptance of argument not for its strength but because receiver has pity
Appeal to Envy	Argumentum ad Envidium	
Appeal to Humor		Arguer uses humor to such an extent that it becomes the focal point; arguer uses humor to entertain rather than enlighten
Appeal to the People (appeal to the masses; appeal to the prejudices of the people; appeal to self-interest; pandering)	Argumentum ad Populum	Arguer appeals to feelings and prejudices of the multitude; arguer appeals to receivers' wants and needs
Direct approach (mob appeal; crowd infection; crowd emotion; appeal to provincialism)		Arguer arouses mob mentality; seeks to turn receivers from thinking individuals into a reacting "mob"; arguer wants receivers to see the world through the eyes of the group with which they identify
Indirect approach (individuals in crowd)		Arguer appeals to receiver's desire for security, love, respect, etc.
bandwagon argument (appeal to popularity; authority of the many; appeal to popular opinion)		Arguer appeals to receiver's desire not to be left behind, to be popular, to belong and be included in a group; justifies something strictly by appeal to numbers
appeal to vanity		Arguer appeals to receiver's desire to be respected and admired
appeal to snobbery (authority of the select few)	Argumentum ad Superbium	Arguer appeals to receiver's desire to be better than others; arguer targets receivers' feelings of superiority and exclusivity; usually involves praise or flattery

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition

Fallacies of Relevance: Distraction Fallacies (continued)

Appeal to Authority (appeal to unqualified authority; appeal to prestige; fallacy of false authority)

	Argumentum ad Verecundiam	Arguer cites untrustworthy authority; arguer relies on authority or prestige of parties having no legitimate claim to authority in the matter at hand

authority lacks requisite expertise

                 The so-called authority is not an authority on the issue at hand

disagreement among experts
authority is biased or prejudiced
authority has motive to lie or disseminate "misinformation"
authority lacks requisite ability to perceive or recall

Appeal to Time

Appeal to the Ages (appeal to tradition; fallacy of traditional wisdom; sacred cows)	Argumentum ad Antiguitam	Arguer uses the past to justify claims made in the present; arguer equates truth and tradition; arguer believes customs of forbears are presumptively good; arguer assumes that because a view or position has been held for many years, it is correct
Appeal to Common Practice		Arguer believes what is common practice is acceptable
Appeal to Novelty	Argumentum ad Novitam	Arguer appeals to newness, modernity, current mores, or youth; arguer believes change is presumptively good
Appeal to Precedent		Arguer uses prior (similar) cases or instances as justification for present

Appeal to Attitude (dismissal)

		Arguer offers an attitude as evidence for dismissing an argument/claim
Appeal to Ridicule		Arguer dismisses a claim as being ridiculous
Appeal to Indignation		Arguer dismisses a claim with an attitude of indignation

Never-ending Appeals

	Argumentum ad nauseum	Arguer repeats and repeats and repeats

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition

Fallacies of Relevance: Distraction Fallacies (continued)

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition
Argument Against the Person (appeal to personal ridicule; personal attack; belittling the opposition)	Argumentum ad Hominem	Arguer discredits other person rather than criticizing other's argument/ideas
attacking the person's being (character assassination)	ad hominem abusive	Arguer verbally abuses other arguer
attacking the person's circumstances (bias ad hominem)	ad hominem circumstantial	Arguer discredits other due to his/her circumstances
attacking the person's sanity (psychological ad hominem)		Arguer discredits an argument by questioning the mental state of the arguer
attacking the person's consistency (inconsistency ad hominem)		Arguer accuses other of inconsistent deeds and words
thou also	tu quoque	Arguer points out other arguer is a hypocrite: "you too have sinned"; meets a personal charge with a personal counter-charge
Argument For the Person (good intentions fallacy)		Arguer praises source of an argument as proof of claim

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition
Fallacies of Relevance: Distortion Fallacies		Premises are logically irrelevant to the conclusion; arguer's premises are malformed with respect to the conclusion and the conclusion is twisted with respect to the premises
Generalization Distortions		
Weak Analogy (fallacy of questionable analogy; faulty analogy)		Improper association of two cases
irrelevant attributes		Conclusion is based on attributes unrelated to focus of similarity between cases; arguer ignores or overlooks relevant, weakening differences between two cases
guilt by association		People are judged guilty solely on the basis of the company they keep or the places they frequent
false positioning (virtue by association)		Arguer tries to capitalize on someone else's earned reputation to sell something or to enhance his/her own status; people are judged virtuous solely on the basis of the company they keep or the places they frequent
Attacking the Illustration Fallacy		Arguer treats an analogy too literally, expecting perfect alikeness of the cases; arguer points out irrelevant differences between cases
Hasty Generalization (converse accident; fallacy of selective instances; hasty conclusion; over-generalizing)	Secundum Quid	Conclusion is based on insufficient evidence
inadequate samples		Conclusion is based on insufficient data; sample is not large enough
atypical examples		Conclusion is drawn from atypical sample; sample is biased
knowing the unknowable		Conclusion is drawn from unknowable evidence
Accident (hasty application; sweeping generalization)	A Dicto Simpliciter	General rule is applied to a specific case it was not intended to cover; arguer overlooks qualifications attached to a general rule
Extrapolation		General rule is extended to a specific time or context it was not intend to cover
gambler's fallacy		Arguer assumes random events follow self-correcting rule; arguer assumes that the run of a chance event alters the probability of that event in future
golden mean		Arguer assumes the mean between two extremes is the most desirable position
argument from the heap		Arguer assumes a series of insignificant changes cannot be equivalent to a significant change (e.g., If a has 1¢, a's not rich; if a's not rich, giving a 1¢ won't make a rich; thus, no matter how many times you give a 1¢, that person will not become rich)

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition

Fallacies of Relevance: Distortion Fallacies (continued)

Claim Distortions

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition
Unrelated Conclusion	Non Sequitur	The conclusion doesn't follow from the premises
Irrelevant Conclusion (missing the point; ignorance of the proof; irrelevant evidence)	Ignoratio Elenchi	Arguer draws conclusion different from that supported by premises
Argument from Ignorance	Argumentum ad Ignorantiam	Arguer draws conclusion when premises report nothing is known/proven; arguer argues that a proposition is true simply on the basis it has not been proved false, or that it is false because it has not been proved true; arguer confuses a lack of proof (ignorance) with a refutation
Two Wrongs		Arguer presumes two wrongs make a right; justifies improper behavior as justified or caused by errors/improper behavior of opposition
False Cause		Arguer draws conclusion that depends on nonexistent or minor causal connection
after this, therefore because of this (questionable cause fallacy)	post hoc ergo propter hoc	Arguer assumes causal relation among events because they are related in time; arguer presumes temporal succession of two events means the first event causes the second event; arguer asserts that one event is the cause of another from the mere fact that the first occurred prior to the second
not the cause for the cause	non causa pro causa	Arguer assumes a causal relation among events because they are related in space; what is taken for the cause isn't the cause at all
concomitant variation		Arguer assumes that because two events show a high incidence of correlation they are therefore causally connected
irreversible order		Arguer assumes that if a causes b, then b cannot also cause a.
regression to the mean		Arguer assumes that normal chance variations are causally determined (i.e., Arguer assumes a bad performance that is followed by a good one is caused by something rather than just reflecting bad luck the first time and a normal performance the second time)
oversimplified cause		One of many causes treated as if it were the sole cause
appeal to superstition (magical thinking)	Argumentum ad Superstitionem	Arguer uncritically attributes causal power to thoughts and words, i.e., The act of thinking about something is sufficient to trigger its occurrence
Slippery Slope (domino effect; wedge argument)		Arguer draws conclusion that depends on an unlikely chain reaction of events

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	DEFINITION

Fallacies of Relevance: Distortion Fallacies (continued)

Argument Distortions (diversion)

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	DEFINITION
False Dichotomy (false bifurcation; either-or fallacy)		arguer offers alternatives that are not mutually exclusive and exhaustive; arguer fails to consider or imagine one or more genuine possibilities
Red Herring (fallacy of irrelevant thesis)		arguer changes subject (without receiver's awareness) to lead receiver astray; arguer introduces a logically separate and irrelevant issue into a discussion for purposes of diverting scrutiny away from the issue being evaluated; arguer proves a conclusion that is not the one at issue
arguing a side issue		arguer draws attention to a side issue where arguer feels particularly strong
seizing on a trivial point		arguer locates and magnify's another's weak or indefensible argument out of all proportion to discredit other's entire position
demanding perfection		arguer attacks opponent's argument for being imperfect
Straw argument (straw man)		arguer attacks a misstated and weakened version of an opponent's argument
taking it to an extreme (all or nothing mistake; reduction to absurdity)	Reductio ad Absurdum	arguer attacks the extreme (non-representative) form of a claim/argument
criticizing previous version		arguer attacks an early and relatively crude version of a theory/argument, neglecting the more developed and powerful current ones
taking argument out of context		arguer takes part of an argument out of context and attacks that
misstatement		arguer knocks down a misstated argument and concludes that the original argument was bad
Scapegoating		arguer blames a difficult issue or social problem on a particular group of people; a group of people is blamed collectively for the difficulty of the current situation

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition
Fallacies of Presumption		Premises presume what they purport to prove

Assumption

Begging the Question (request for the source)	Petitio Principii	Arguer uses some form of its own conclusion as part of the evidence offered to support that very conclusion
synonymous question-begging		Premise is restated synonymous form of the conclusion
generalization question-begging		Arguer uses a premise that is a generalization that contains the conclusion as an instance of that generalization
Circular Reasoning (arguing in a circle)	Circulus in Probando	One or more unproven claims is used to prove other(s)
Complex Question	Plurium Interrogationum	Multiple questions concealed in a single question; a question is worded so it assumes answer to implicit prior question
Direct Assumption		Compound claims; multiple claims concealed in a single claim
Question-Begging Epithets		Arguer uses slanted language that reaffirms what needs to be proven but hasn't

Suppression

Suppressed Evidence (card-stacking)		Arguer ignores important evidence that requires a different conclusion in his/her own argument
failure to mention evidence		Arguer presents only facts favorable to conclusion while suppressing relevant but non-supportive facts
quoted passages out of context		Arguer removes a quotation from its context, thereby changing its meaning
vicious abstraction		Arguer removes a statement from its context, thereby changing its meaning
Suppressed Counterclaims		Arguer improperly rejects others' arguments that require a different conclusion
poisoning the wells (falsification error; truth by definition; self-sealing arguments)		Arguer forwards a claim against which no evidence whatsoever can be brought; all evidence is (re-)interpreted to support the claim; arguer offers no criteria for refutation or falsifiability; arguer "saves" claim by making it true by definition
willed ignorance (invincible ignorance; universal discounting)		Arguer accepts claim uncritically and insists on the legitimacy of an idea or principle despite contradictory fact (e.g., I don't care what you say….; Be that as it may…; etc.)
shifting ground		Arguer will change his/her challenged initial position to another position; arguer slides back and forth between positions or abandons initial position and adopts a new one
evasion		Arguer bypasses a critical issue
refusal to debate		Arguer refuses to argue
refusal to engage		Arguer refuses to engage in argument
abandon discussion		Arguer cuts off debate rather than respond

FALLACY	LATIN NAME	Definition

Fallacies of Meaning

Ambiguity

Problem with argument's language such that expression is susceptible to different interpretations in a given context

- Equivocation — Conclusion depends on shift in meaning of word or phrase
- Amphiboly — Conclusion depends on the wrong interpretation of a syntactically ambiguous statement
- Accent

Grammatical Analogy — Synergy is ignored/misapplied
- Composition — Attribute is wrongly transferred from parts to whole
- Division — Attribute is wrongly transferred from whole to parts
- Hypostatization — Human attributes wrongly transferred to non-human things

Concealment
- Doublespeak — Arguer misuses language to say something other than, or alter perceptions of, what really occurs or is true
  - euphemism — Arguer uses inoffensive or positive word/phrase to avoid facing harsh, unpleasant, or distasteful reality
  - jargon — Arguer uses jargon before non-technical audience to make the simple/ordinary appear complex/special
  - buzzwords — Arguer uses vague words/phrases devoid of meaning to create impression of action, dynamism & vitality
  - puffery — Arguer uses obscure/technical/complex words/grammar for purpose of inflating the content of a claim
  - gobbledygook (bureaucratese) — Arguer overwhelms receivers with volume/complexity of words/language; arguer uses big words and long sentences as evidence of claims
- Unspecified Quantifiers — Arguer avoids using the quantifier "all" or "no", though reasons as if used them rather than "some"
- Special Pleading — Arguer uses a double standard for labeling behavior, events, and things, favoring oneself and prejudiced against others (e.g., I am firm, you are stubborn, he is pigheaded; our troops are heroic, devoted, and self-sacrificing and their troops are savage and fanatical)
- Emotionally Loaded Language — Arguer uses language which exceeds the natural warmth that marks a sincerely expressed belief and earnestness of purpose