

[Click Here](#)



fallacies in words. The confusion generated here is that "smell" can be ambiguously interpreted. On the one hand, someone can do smell, while on the other hand, they can have a smell. Here, the two uses of the term are used side-by-side to achieve comic effect. The idea is that the questioner wants to know how the dog achieves the ability to smell. However, his friend replies that the dog has a smell, thereby responding with the wrong word for the term. Scenario: The person tells his partner the cause of the divorce is free radicals. His wife's response is as follows: "All evil in the world is caused by free radicals." Ambiguous Phrase: Radical. In this dialogue, the person acts as referring to the "radical" in the medical sense. These are molecules in the body that supposedly cause the aging process. However, his wife, who understands "radicals" in a political context, falls into the typical fallacy of equivocation by saying that all evil comes from radicals – as in, radical people. Thus, the conflation of two different understandings of the term 'radical' has been achieved here to construct a fallacy – i.e. a logical inconsistency – that has meant the two conversationalists are not on the same page! Scenario: The priest told me I should have faith. I have faith that I will strike it rich on the stock market this year. Therefore, the priest should be happy with me. Ambiguous Phrase: Faith In this scenario, the priest uses the word "faith" to mean that one must believe in the existence of God without resorting to any proof. However, the person talking to the priest understands the word "faith" to mean "belief that something will happen". Thus, he says he has faith ... but not necessarily in God. He's turned the priest's ambiguity against him, and allowed himself to intentionally misinterpret the message of the priest. At his next confessional, he may insist that the priest should be very happy because he took the priest's advice. He went out into the world and focussed more on having faith. The priest, of course, will accuse him of employing the equivocation fallacy to misrepresent the priest's message. Scenario: "All laws were created by someone. Nature has laws. Therefore, there is a God who is the creator." Ambiguous Phrase: Laws This equivocation fallacy is one that we commonly come across among people arguing for the existence of God. In this fallacy, they are conflating laws governing society and laws governing nature. Legal laws (e.g. laws set by a government) obviously have human creators. In fact, we can go and look at the bills created in parliament and see who signed their name against them! But laws of nature do not have an obvious creator in the same sense – they're simply a set of physical constraints on how the world can operate. People who are religious may say that their claim is correct, but humanists and scientists might argue that the laws come from physics, not a god per se. Whether we believe in god or not, this frequently may be the best argument for god. In this sense, the equivocation fallacy is employed by conflating legal laws and physical laws in order to prosecute evidence for God. This also happens to be an example of a false dilemma fallacy. Scenario: Cotton is light. What is light is not dark. So, cotton cannot be dark. Ambiguous Phrase: Light In this example, we see an erroneous conclusion based on the multiple meanings of the word "light". In the first sentence, the word "light" is used to refer to the relative weight of cotton, while in the second sentence we encounter use of "light" to express color. And as a result, we are faced with the absurd conclusion from this confusion that cotton is "light" and therefore "cannot be dark". A child might make this equivocation fallacy if they find some blackened cotton, and fails to realize that it's cotton because "it's not light". Scenario: We witness many miracles such as cyborgs and space travel every passing day. So when athletes say there is no miracle, they are wrong. Ambiguous Phrase: Miracles In this example, the person conflates religious miracles and the hyperbolic use of the term 'miracle' to express wonderment. In the first sentence, the term miracle is employed to indicate that something is marvelous. Isn't it amazing that people can travel to space! We may hyperbolically call this a miracle, but in reality, it's simply a feat of science. In the second sentence, the person states that atheists are wrong in their claim that so-called miracles do not actually exist. In this example, "miracle" is used to mean something achieved by a God that defies nature. Equivocation fallacies are fallacies that people often fall into, consciously or unconsciously, especially in discussions about politics, religion, or science in daily life. Therefore, in arguments accompanied by seriousness, i.e. when we are sure that the parties are not joking with each other, it can be very useful to be aware of the equivocation fallacy to prevent any of the members of the dialogue from reaching erroneous conclusions by using a word with more than one meaning. The Equivocation Fallacy is a logical error that occurs when a word or phrase is used ambiguously within an argument, resulting in a misleading or invalid conclusion. This fallacy exploits the multiple meanings of a term to confuse the audience or dispute the facts that should be true. Understanding this fallacy is essential for constructing clear, persuasive arguments and for recognizing faulty reasoning in debates and discussions. Equivocation happens when a key term or phrase shifts its meaning in the middle of an argument. It typically involves using a word with more than one definition and treating these definitions as if they were the same. This creates the illusion of a logical connection between ideas that, upon closer examination, is unrelated. For example: Premise 1: A feather is light. Premise 2: What is light cannot be dark. Conclusion: Therefore, a feather cannot be dark. In this argument, the word "light" is used with two different meanings: one refers to weight, and the other to brightness. The ambiguity renders the argument invalid. Ambiguous Language: The fallacy relies on a word or phrase with multiple meanings. Shifting Definitions: The meaning of the term changes partway through the argument. Deceptive Reasoning: The argument appears logical on the surface but falls apart under scrutiny. Premise: Only man is rational. Premise: No woman is a man. Conclusion: Therefore, no woman is rational. Here, "man" shifts in meaning from "human being" in the first premise to "male human" in the second premise. Premise: The government should not interfere with the free market because people deserve freedom. Conclusion: Therefore, the government should not regulate industries. In this example, "freedom" equivocates between individual liberty and market deregulation, which are not necessarily the same. "We guarantee our product is fast!" In this case, "fast" could mean quick delivery, rapid performance, or ease of use, but the ambiguity allows the advertiser to avoid specifying which meaning applies. Premise: Laws are made to be broken. Premise: Breaking the speed limit is against the law. Conclusion: Therefore, it's acceptable to break the speed limit. The equivocation lies in the phrase "laws are made to be broken," which shifts from referring to guidelines that accommodate exceptions to literal legal violations. To identify equivocation, ask the following questions: Does the argument rely on a term with multiple meanings? Is the term being used consistently throughout the argument? Would the conclusion still hold if the term's meaning were clarified or defined explicitly? Equivocation often arises unintentionally due to unclear communication, but it can also be used deliberately to mislead. Common reasons include: Complex Language: Words with multiple definitions create confusion. Lack of Precision: Ambiguous phrasing can obscure critical facts. Persuasion Tactics: Shifting meanings can manipulate emotions or distract from weak reasoning. Equivocation undermines the credibility of an argument by exposing logical inconsistencies. It can lead to misunderstandings, derail productive discussions, and erode trust in a speaker's intentions. Define Terms Clearly: Specify the intended meaning of key terms upfront to prevent ambiguity. Be Consistent: Use words with the same meaning throughout the argument. Request Clarification: If someone else's argument seems ambiguous, ask them to explain their terms. "Faith is important for science because scientists must have faith in their methods." Here, "faith" shifts from religious belief to confidence in a scientific process, creating a misleading connection. "This candidate has a lot of experience. Experience is what matters most, so we should hire them." The word "experience" may refer to time spent in a field or the quality of that experience. The ambiguity can influence decision-making. "A fetus is a human, and humans have rights. Therefore, a fetus has full human rights." The term "human" may shift between biological classification and moral personhood, making the argument unclear. The Equivocation Fallacy is a common but avoidable error in reasoning that hinges on the ambiguous use of language. By recognizing how meanings shift within arguments, we can better evaluate the validity of claims and construct clearer, more logical discussions. Avoiding equivocation strengthens communication and ensures that debates focus on substance rather than semantics. No hashtags A few can mean three, as you've probably heard others say (and very possibly stated yourself), or four or seven. There is no set limit for how many constitute "a few." Likewise, there isn't a clear limit for what constitutes "several things" or "a couple of things." So, if you are using double-meaning words or phrases and deceiving somebody, you are committing the equivocation fallacy. What would you think if someone told you they were a brilliant student because they occasionally slept in class? What would you think if they were questioned about their claim and it came out that they had missed two classes during the semester? You might feel duped and point out that they purposely hid how frequently they slept through class by using the phrase's ambiguity. Equivocation is a term used to describe this type of dishonesty. What is the logical equivocation fallacy? Equivocation, which is a mix of drinks in addition. A consultant claims they haven't worked for your main rival but leaves out that they have for other rivals. A doctor states that medicine can have slight side effects when he knows that the medicine can cause a heart attack. What is the equivocation fallacy used for? Equivocation is a common obfuscation technique. Equivocation is also referred to as doublespeak, which you may be familiar with. Several examples of doublespeak in English are as follows: A bit shaky instead of very poor quality person of interest instead of subject passed away instead of died Euphemisms are frequently used in doublespeak, but they are not always used. For example, equivocation can be one of the toughest logical fallacies to spot in a piece of writing since there are so many different ways to use it. In writing, you can spot the equivocation fallacy by carefully scrutinizing an argument to find the discrepancy between the arguer's initial assertion and their final conclusion. In some circumstances, you must scrutinize the argument and distinguish between the writer's opinion and the facts. Total Assignment Help Incase, you are looking for an opportunity to work from home and earn big money, Total Assignment Help has the best choice for you. Do visit for more details. Assignment help is an assignment service available in 9 countries. Our local operation spans across Australia, US, UK, South East Asia and the Middle East. With extensive experience in academic writing, Total assignment help has a strong track record delivering quality writing at a nominal price that meet the unique needs of students in our local markets. We have specialized network of highly trained writers, who can provide best possible assignment help solution for all your needs. Next time you are looking for assignment help, make sure to give us a try. Get the best Assignment Help from leading experts from the field of academics with assured ontime, 100% plagiarism free and top Quality delivery. Order Now Equivocation Fallacy Example Puff Daddy Star outer space: Lev Svitarsky / Moment, cartoon Puff Daddy: doodlemania / DigitalVision Vectors It's all about the meaning. This is especially true when it comes to equivocation fallacies, which is when a word or phrase is used with a different meaning or ambiguously to create a fallacy. Explore equivocation examples found in real-life situations, media, and literature. Considered a logical fallacy, equivocation fallacies arise from ambiguity. Words or phrases in these fallacies can be used ambiguously or have double meanings. For example: It's true that Puff Daddy is a star. A giant ball of gas is a star.However, Puff Daddy is not a giant ball of gas. See the ambiguity? In the example, the word 'star' is used to mean a famous person and a celestial body. The double meaning of the word 'star' creates the fallacy. So an argument using equivocation will appear to be valid but given the double meaning of the word, it is not. See this in action through some real-life examples. In 2006, George Bush stated: The United States does not torture. Looking at this statement it seems pretty clear. However, this was an equivocation fallacy because George Bush's statement was true but only based on a specific definition he gave the word 'torture.' His definition of torture left out waterboarding and mock execution. A drunk driver gets pulled over by a police officer. Visually inebriated, the driver tells the officer: I only had a few beers. In this context, the driver is saying, in truth, he only had a few beers. However, this doesn't cover the huge amount of alcohol he may have consumed. In this case, he's using the word 'beers' to mean only a few alcoholic beverages. While politicians use equivocation fallacy pretty regularly, it's also used in media. In an advertisement, equivocation fallacy is typically found to be clever or add humor. For example, a billboard company might advertise their billboards by saying: Looking for a sign? This is it! The double meaning is found in the word 'sign.' While billboard is a sign, the statement also plays on a sign from God. Therefore, the billboard is a sign from a deity, so you should advertise here. Laughter is always good advertising. Check out a few more funny examples. In a humorous media campaign "Clean your dirty balls", AXE used equivocation fallacy to play on the double meaning of the word 'balls'. In ads and television commercials, this soap, designed for men, was used to clean dirty sports equipment. However, the ads had a double meaning since the product line is designed for cleaning men's bodies. Think about that for a minute. Equivocation fallacy can work great in comedy. Just ask Abbot & Costello in their famous Who's on First bit. The joke starts out: Abbott: Well, let's see, we have on the bags, Who's on first. Who's on first. I Don't Know is on third...Costello: That's what I want to find out.Abbott: I say Who's on first, What's on second, I Don't Know's on third.Costello: Are you the manager?Abbott: Yes.Costello: You gonna be the coach too?Abbott: Yes.Costello: And you don't know the fellows' names?Abbott: Well I should.Costello: Well then who's on first?Abbott: Yes. By giving the players names like Who, What, and I Don't Know, the comedians make comedic use of equivocation fallacy that is a laughing good time. When you're looking for a good equivocation example, look no further than literature. The double meaning or ambiguity of equivocation can come in handy as a plot device, just ask Shakespeare. Shakespeare actually makes a lot of use of equivocation in his story of Macbeth. However, one of the most famous uses is when Macbeth visits the witches. Be bloody, bold, and resolute; laugh to scorn / The power of man, for none of woman born / Shall harm Macbeth. The fact that 'none of woman born' can harm Macbeth makes him sound invincible. However, when the witches say 'none of woman born,' they actually mean those of natural childbirth. Those born from a cesarean section don't count. Hence the reasons Macduff isn't 'of woman born.' Very tricky Mr. Shakespeare! The ambiguity of words can be used to your advantage, especially when you're trying to deceive someone. Just ask politicians: Would you like to learn more about fallacies? Don't just stop at equivocation: explore examples of false dilemmas and circular reasoning. You won't believe all the fallacy examples out there. Have you ever found yourself confused by a statement that seems to twist meanings right before your eyes? That's the essence of the equivocation fallacy. This sneaky form of reasoning plays on the multiple meanings of words, leading to misleading conclusions and misunderstandings. It can pop up in everyday conversations, debates, or even persuasive writing. The equivocation fallacy involves using ambiguous language that misleads or confuses. It often leads to erroneous conclusions based on double meanings of words. An equivocation fallacy occurs when a term is used with different meanings in an argument, creating confusion. For instance, consider the statement: "A feather is light; therefore, a light feather can't be heavy." Here, the word "light" shifts from being a descriptor of weight to indicating brightness. This shifting meaning misleads the conclusion.Equivocation has roots in ancient rhetoric and philosophy. Aristotle discussed ambiguous language as misleading in arguments. Throughout history, philosophers and logicians have highlighted its role in debates and discussions, emphasizing the importance of clarity. The use of equivocation can be traced back to various texts, illustrating how it remains relevant across contexts like politics or advertising today. Recognizing the equivocation fallacy involves understanding how ambiguous language misleads arguments. This fallacy often appears in everyday discussions and can distort reasoning.Consider the statement: "I have the right to watch 'The Real Housewives'; so it's right for me to watch it." Here, "right" shifts from a legal entitlement to a moral justification.Another example is: "A bank is a place where you deposit money; therefore, a riverbank must be similar." The term "bank" changes context between finance and geography, leading to confusion.A classic case shows up in this form: "All trees have bark; all dogs bark; therefore, all dogs are trees." Here, "bark" serves two distinct meanings yet creates a misleading conclusion. Identifying equivocation requires careful analysis of language used within an argument. Look for terms that might have multiple meanings or contexts. Check for shifts in meaning. If a word changes its sense during an argument, you may face equivocation. Examine claims closely. Determine if conclusions rely on ambiguous phrases.Assess context thoroughly: Consider whether the surrounding discussion clarifies or complicates terms. By honing these skills, you strengthen your ability to spot and challenge equivocation effectively.Equivocation fallacies can severely impact communication and reasoning. Understanding their implications enhances your ability to engage in clear discussions. In everyday conversations, equivocation can lead to misunderstandings. For example, when someone says, "I can't trust him; he's a politician," the word "trust" might shift from a personal feeling to a general implication about politicians. This ambiguity can create barriers in meaningful dialogue.Another common instance occurs with statements like, "The law is the law." Here, "law" may refer to legal statutes or societal norms. Such shifts confuse listeners and obscure the speaker's intent.In formal arguments, equivocation undermines logical integrity. Consider the claim: "All trees have bark; all dogs bark; therefore, all dogs are trees." The term "bark" shifts meanings between different contexts—leading to a false conclusion. Legal discussions often feature equivocal language too. A lawyer might say, "Ignorance of the law is no excuse," using "ignorance" ambiguously between awareness of specific laws versus general knowledge of legal systems. This can mislead jurors or judges regarding culpability.Understanding these examples helps you recognize how equivocation operates across various contexts. By identifying ambiguous terms and phrases early on, you strengthen your argumentation skills and enhance clarity in communication.Understanding how to avoid the equivocation fallacy enhances clarity in communication. This approach involves recognizing ambiguous language and ensuring that terms remain consistent throughout your argument. To communicate clearly, consider these strategies: Define key terms: Always clarify what you mean by specific words at the beginning of your argument. For instance, specify whether "right" refers to a legal entitlement or a moral right. Use precise language: Replace vague terms with specific descriptors. Instead of saying "light," use "not heavy" or "bright" depending on context.Eliminate ambiguity: Rephrase statements that could be interpreted in multiple ways. For example, instead of saying "the bank is near," add context like "the river bank" or "financial." Avoid double meanings: Be aware of words that have multiple meanings. For instance, "right" can mean a legal right or a moral right. Clarify your intent: Make sure your audience understands your message without confusion. Various tools can assist in analyzing potential equivocations: Logical frameworks: Use syllogisms to test arguments for consistency. If an argument fails when rephrased using different words, it may contain equivocal terms. Peer review: Share your argument with others who can identify unclear sections. They might see ambiguities you overlook.Contextual analysis: Examine how a term functions within different contexts. Recognizing shifts in meaning helps pinpoint where confusion arises. Employing these tools strengthens your critical thinking skills while refining your ability to spot equivocation fallacies quickly. Equivocation FallacyEquivocation Fallacy Definition:Equivocation fallacy is when someone has a specific meaning in mind for a word but uses a different term instead, which changes the meaning of their argument. In this article, we will explore an example of an equivocation fallacy and explore what happens when someone uses this fallacy as part of an argument. Jane presented arguments for why the city should buy her goldfish stand. There are several reasons the city should buy my goldfish stand.Rhetoric and Equivocation FallacyRhetoric is basically a skill set that can be used to persuade. It's also considered a joke and is not taken seriously in most cases. However, it is true that it can be used to persuade and is sometimes a form of art. It's also true that it can be a form of logical reasoning.In Rhetoric, several fallacies are used to make the argument seem stronger. Equivocations Fallacy is one of the more popular ones.Equivocation is a fallacy in which a term means one thing in one place and is suddenly restricted to another meaning in a different place. It is an issue of ambiguity and can be applied to analogies and to definitions.The fallacy occurs when there are two different definitions for the same word, and one definition is used in one place, and the other definition is used in another place.The Equivocation Fallacy is an often-cited form of argument known as a logical fallacy. Critics of this argument cite situations where people confuse two different meanings of a term and then make an assertion contrary to the normal meaning.One way to think about the Equivocation Fallacy is to think of it as being similar to a slippery slope argument. One example of an Equivocation Fallacy is when a person says that they have a "right to bear arms."Equivocation Fallacy ExamplesEquivocation Fallacy Examples in real lifeExamples of Equivocation Fallacy in Real Life: Don't miss out on the best discounts and top-rated products available right now! Shop Now and Save Big Today!*As an Amazon Associate, I earn from qualifying purchases.A person who is in the military and has been deployed overseas for a long time might say, "I'm not going to be home this Christmas."The speaker means that they will not be home on December 25th because of their deployment, but some people may interpret it as meaning that they are never coming back at all.This is an example of equivocation fallacy because there was no clear explanation about what the speaker meant by "not going to be home."Equivocation Fallacy Examples in Media:Examples of Equivocation Fallacy in Media:Popular example of equivocation fallacy in media is using a word's meaning to change an argument.For instance, when someone says, "I'm not racist because I have black friends," they are using the definition of racism as prejudice against people because of their skin color and then changing it to mean discrimination against people based on their race.This changes the meaning of the word and makes it seem like it doesn't apply to them.Equivocation Fallacy Examples in Advertising:Examples of Equivocation Fallacy in Advertisements:Equivocation Fallacy is when a word or phrase has two different meanings, and the speaker uses one meaning in one sentence and another meaning in a second sentence. For example: "I can't believe you ate all my cookies!" (The speaker means that they are surprised because they were expecting their friend to share) vs. "I can't believe you ate all my cookies!" (The speaker is angry because their friend stole them).Don't miss out on the best discounts and top-rated products available right now! Shop Now and Save Big Today!*As an Amazon Associate, I earn from qualifying purchases.Equivocation Fallacy Examples in Politics:Equivocation is a fallacy of ambiguity that occurs when someone uses the same word in two different senses within a sentence, and it's not clear which sense they mean.For example, "I'm going to make this perfectly clear" could be interpreted as meaning either "I will explain this so there are no misunderstandings" or "This will be easy to understand."The first interpretation is an example of equivocation because the speaker has used one word with two different meanings.The second interpretation is not an example of equivocation because the speaker has used one word with only one meaning.Equivocation Fallacy Examples in Movies:Examples of Equivocation Fallacy in Movies:The protagonist in the movie is a detective who says, "I'm not saying that you're lying." A character in the film says, "It's not like I'm going to be able to do anything about it." The main character of the story says, "I'll never stop trying."Equivocation Fallacy Examples in Literature:Examples of Equivocation Fallacy in Literature:Equivocation is the use of a word with more than one meaning, especially in such a way that the different meanings are incompatible or incongruous.In literature, equivocation can be found when an author uses words to mean something different from what they typically mean.Don't miss out on the best discounts and top-rated products available right now! Shop Now and Save Big Today!*As an Amazon Associate, I earn from qualifying purchases.For example, if someone says "I'm going to take a shower" and then goes outside for 30 minutes without taking off their clothes, this would be considered equivocation because it's not clear whether they meant "take a bath" or "take a walk."Equivocation Fallacy Examples in News:Examples of Equivocation Fallacy in News: The article claims that the President is a liar because he said, "I never told Comey to stop investigating Flynn," and then later admitted in an interview with NBC News' Lester Holt, "I did fire him, yeah."A statement can be true in one sense but false in another sense. For example, if I say "The sky is blue," it's true that the sky's color is blue; however, it's not true that there are no clouds up there. When it comes to language, there's always a chance of flawed logic or ambiguity taking over and changing the validity of its grammar. Equivocation fallacy is one such type of flawed logic that is sometimes intentionally used to depict humor. Did You Know? Equivocation literally means 'to speak in more than one voice.' Tell us what comes to your mind when you read this: Religion teaches us that having faith is necessary when we pray for whatever it is that we want. Faith is defined as an irrational belief in the absence of concrete evidence. Therefore, religion promotes irrationality. Wait, what?! Something doesn't quite add up there, does it? Religions don't promote irrationality, but it is the structure of that sentence that makes it seem so. Every language is so versatile, and gives us countless opportunities to shape our sentences and phrases the way we want, so as to create the desired effect of the same. However, sometimes, certain sentences or phrases can be rather vague and ambiguous, which might lead to a confused interpretation. At other times, sentences are deliberately misinterpreted for a funny effect. These misinterpreted phrases may lead the listener/reader to false a conclusion that is far from the truth. Experts call this phenomenon a fallacy of ambiguity. So what is a fallacy of ambiguity? It is, like the name suggests, a flawed logic where a phrase or a sentence does not have a concrete, clear, well-understood meaning, but is vague and disoriented. Such types of fallacies not only are capable of misinterpreting any statement, but are also capable of drawing incorrect conclusions. Ambiguous fallacy types are several, and are often used intentionally or unintentionally for making sarcastic or humorous statements. The most popularly used fallacies of ambiguity are accent, amphiboly, composition, division, and equivocation. Equivocation Fallacy: Meaning Whenever any word is used in order to make a statement or an argument, ideally, it should be used in a way that it has the same meaning for a consistent period of time, right? Equivocation fallacy begs to differ. Equivocation fallacy occurs when one word has two different meanings. Simply put, the same word is used in two different contexts in the same phrase. Phrases that contain equivocation fallacy are not grammatically incorrect, but a change in the meaning of a word tends to change the subject of that sentence or phrase instead. Equivocation fallacy is intentionally used to depict humor or puns, more often by cartoonists. Both meanings of the same word are factually and grammatically correct when used in different contexts, but end up making an illogical statement when used in the same sentence/phrase/argument. This fallacy makes an invalid argument or a phrase look like it is actually valid and reliable. To make the concept easier, we have covered some popular and easy-to-understand examples of this type of fallacy in the next section. Equivocation Fallacy: Examples Sometimes, Sometimes, equivocation fallacy occurs unintentionally, but there are times when it is used on purpose. Let us look at some popular, hilarious, and widely-used examples of equivocation fallacy in politics, media, and in our everyday lives. For better understanding, we are highlighting the words where equivocation fallacy can be observed. Context 1: The sign says "fine for parking here." Context 2: The sign says parking is fine.Conclusion: I'm parking my car here. Trees have branches. My bank has branches all over the world. Therefore, my bank is a tree. Two wrongs don't make a right, but three lefts make a right. All killers are inhuman. Hence, no killer is a human. Thrilling books are very rare. Rare books are expensive. So, thrilling books are expensive. A noisy child is a headache. My medicine makes a headache go away. So, my medicine makes children go away. Jesus is the word of God. The Bible is the word of God. So, Jesus is the Bible. Money put in the bank earns you interest. A bank is the land beside a river. If I want interest on my money, I must put it in the land beside the river. All trees have bark. Every dog barks. Therefore, every dog is a tree. It is expected that we only do what is right. We have the right to eat as much as we want. Therefore, it is right to eat as much as you want. Man is rational. No woman is a man. Therefore, women are not rational. (Really? We don't find this funny!) Be bloody, bold, and resolute; laugh to scorn the power of man, for none of woman born shall harm Macbeth. - Macbeth (Act 4, Scene 1) Shakespeare used equivocation in Macbeth, but eventually it is Macduff who kills Macbeth, and he is born by the Caesarian section (ripped untimely from his mother's womb) so is not "mother-born" in that sense. However, the scene we've mentioned above leads us to initially believe that Macbeth is immortal or invincible. So these were some examples of equivocation fallacy. Isn't it funny how one word can change the meaning of a phrase or an argument entirely just because it is not used in the correct context? Can you think of more examples of equivocation fallacy? If yes, feel free to let us know through the comments below! Disclaimer: The examples provided in this article are not meant to offend anyone in any way. Welcome to GrammarBrain. Let's learn English and proper grammar together. Ready to have some fun? The latest from our experts. Is it sit in a chair or sit on a chair? It is experience with or experience in? Thank you! Your submission has been received! Oops! Something went wrong while submitting the form.