The average found by dividing by the number of games is grossly extravagant.

LOSING AVERAGES.—Properly, the loser's average can never be higher than the winner's. To concede that it can is to premiumize its maker's inefficiency. Setting out to win the opening shot, he had failed, which it the only way, with fewer points, to make the seemingly higher average. It is equally unfair, in a continuous game of several sessions, to concede an average for a fraction of the game. By getting far behind, one player is without limit on any night, while the other is stopped every night by reaching the number of points assigned to every leader.

Except as personal compliments, losing averages are valueless. Their apparent makers do not wholly make them. Much depends upon the other man. The loser reaches a high figure largely because, having aimed to cover a given number of points, he failed to do so. It has often happened that a player with 50 to go has needed as many innings to make them as he had taken to make his other 250. As a rule, losers "let down" near the finish more than winners, and hence their average is dependent less upon themselves than upon those who close the game.