

Probability, censuses and error: Pascal to Quetelet

Juan Seguro

Core question

How did probability, population counting and error analysis turn uncertainty and variation into quantities that could be reasoned about collectively?

Historical and evolutionary context

Uncertainty had always existed in trade, games, mortality and government, but it was not yet organised into a general mathematical and administrative language. Between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries, probability theory, population counts, life tables and error analysis created new ways to reason about uncertain events and aggregate regularities.

This was not one continuous invention. Gambling problems, insurance, astronomy, demography and state statistics developed in partly separate settings before becoming mutually reinforcing.

What could communities know before this transition?

Before formal probability and statistical error theory, merchants, gamblers, administrators and astronomers already reasoned about risk, mortality and repeated observation. What was missing was a general mathematical language for expectation, uncertainty, population regularity and the information contained in dispersion rather than only in a single best value.

What changed?

Pascal, Fermat and mathematical expectation

The 1654 correspondence between Blaise Pascal and Pierre de Fermat on problems of games of chance is a conventional landmark because it made expectation and combinatorial reasoning explicit. Huygens published the first printed treatise on probability in 1657. Jakob Bernoulli's posthumous *Ars Conjectandi* (1713) then connected repeated trials to stable frequencies through an early law of large numbers.

Probability did not thereby become a universal science of uncertainty overnight. Its applications expanded gradually through insurance, annuities, astronomy and error theory.

Counting populations

John Graunt's *Natural and Political Observations... upon the Bills of Mortality* (1662) extracted regularities from London death records. This demonstrated that administrative records could reveal population-level patterns not visible in individual cases. Later censuses and civil registration systems enlarged that capacity.

Official statistics were never neutral mirrors. Categories such as occupation, household, race, crime and disease were produced by institutions. Counting made populations governable while also imposing classifications that could erase ambiguity and encode political assumptions.

Error becomes informative

Astronomers confronted repeated measurements that disagreed slightly. Rather than treating every discrepancy as failure, they developed methods for combining observations and characterising error. Probability thereby moved from games toward epistemology: uncertainty itself could be quantified.

Thomas Bayes's posthumous 1763 essay addressed inverse probability, though “Bayesian” statistics as a modern programme came much later. Laplace expanded probabilistic inference dramatically.

Quetelet and the social average

Adolphe Quetelet, trained in astronomy, transferred statistical ideas about measurement and regularity into social analysis. In *Sur l'homme* (1835), he developed “social physics” and the

concept of the *homme moyen*, the average man. Aggregate rates of births, crimes and other events appeared strikingly regular from year to year.

Quetelet's move was powerful and dangerous. Stable averages can reveal population structure, but they do not imply that individuals are governed by deterministic social laws. Later critics showed how averages can hide multimodality, inequality and causal heterogeneity.

Why could this capability emerge?

Commercial arithmetic, games of chance, annuities, mortality records, astronomy and geodesy all created repeated problems of uncertain inference. Legendre (1805) and Gauss (1809) later made least-squares adjustment a central technique for extracting estimates from inconsistent observations.

What later forms of knowledge did it enable?

Probability and error analysis became foundations for astronomy, geodesy, insurance, demography and later statistical inference. The same tools also enabled states to classify populations in ways that could illuminate patterns while reifying categories.

New limits and risks

Turning uncertainty and populations into numbers introduced a new danger: mathematical regularity could be mistaken for a property of nature or society rather than a result conditioned by sampling, definitions and administrative categories. Least-squares methods could reduce random observational scatter while leaving systematic bias untouched, and averages could obscure heterogeneous individuals when the constructed 'typical' case was reified as a real person or norm. Statistical power therefore grew together with risks of classification error, category dependence and political misuse.

What changed in the architecture of knowledge?

Uncertainty became a **quantifiable object**. States could know populations through aggregates; scientists could estimate error; insurers could price risk; and regularities could be extracted from many noisy observations. The same tools also created new risks of reifying categories and treating statistical averages as natural essences.

Loss, exclusion and uncertainty

Quantification can erase the ambiguity it seeks to manage. Censuses impose categories; averages can turn heterogeneous people into an imagined typical person; error models can hide systematic bias. The histories of least squares and social statistics also show how techniques migrate from astronomy into administration with changed ethical consequences.

Dependency map

- INDIRECT ← PIO-040 How numerals travelled: India, Baghdad and Pisa
- INDIRECT ← PIO-022 Money, accounting and trust beyond personal relationships
- INDIRECT ← PIO-051 Academies, journals and the public experiment
- INDIRECT → PIO-068 Mendel and statistical regularity in heredity
- DIRECT → PIO-085 Randomised trials and statistical inference

References

1. Bayes, T. "An Essay towards solving a Problem in the Doctrine of Chances." *Philosophical Transactions* 53, 370–418 (1763). DOI: 10.1098/rstl.1763.0053.
2. Graunt, J. *Natural and Political Observations Mentioned in a Following Index, and Made upon the Bills of Mortality*. London (1662).
3. Quetelet, A. *Sur l'homme et le développement de ses facultés, ou Essai de physique sociale*. Paris (1835).
4. Goldman, L. "Adolphe Quetelet: Social Physics, Determinism, and 'The Average Man'." In *Victorians and Numbers*, 139–155 (2022). DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780192847744.003.0007.
5. Hacking, I. *The Taming of Chance*. Cambridge University Press (1990).