us content to accept it as near enough to our ideal unit-sheep for our purposes. To this ideal unit we give in our minds certain attributes, a certain size, weight, shape, wooliness, etc.

Now, statistics are engaged in determining, through the average or the mode, for groups of similar but unidentical units, what this abstract ideal unit may be. It seeks to determine for any given group of 1,000 sheep, for instance, how wooly 1,000 abstract sheep, all exactly alike, should each be in order that they would have in the aggregate as much total wooliness as the 1,000 real sheep really have in the aggregate, notwithstanding that no two of the sheep have exactly the same wooliness really; and no one of them perhaps has the exact wooliness of the ideal or average sheep.

The average age of a group of people is likewise, not the exact age of any one person, or of any considerable group; but it is the exact age of an abstract person, which age, multiplied by the number in the group, would give the same total as that group now gives, if all its individual ages are added together.

That the five fingers of one hand do not equal five times any one of the fingers may be elaborated to illustrate the mode. Thus, while it is true that five times any one finger is not equal to the five fingers together, yet it is also obvious that five times the thumb is farther from five times the abstract "ideal" finger than five times the forefinger would be, because the forefinger has more "fingerness," is more "fingerlike" than the thumbs. Such is the mode—not the abstract idealized unit exactly equal to the total group when multiplied by the number in the group, but rather the idealized unit which most approximates the prevailing type in the group. In other words, it is an average of the most-like units. Now, this determination of what constitutes "most-likeness" must be left as a rule to the judgment of the