

**Modelling Compound vs. Plaster of Paris.**

By "PHINEAS," Ont.

So much is said and written at the present time about crown and bridge work, porcelain fillings, the construction of difficult regulating appliances, the treatment of pyorrhea alveolaris, the action of ferments, and the principles which underlie ordinary and extraordinary dental operations, that the writer almost feels as though he ought to apologize to the readers of this JOURNAL for introducing so common-place a subject as the taking of impressions. If the hundreds of young men who have just graduated from the dental colleges of the United States and Canada, were to be asked what material is the best for taking impressions, probably nineteen out of twenty would answer, plaster of Paris. That is what our college professors say, and that is what we learn from our text-books. By the average American graduate, a hint that such is not the case would be taken as an evidence of ignorance or incompetence; and yet it is safe to say, that after those young men have been in practice for a few years, many of them will use modelling compound for a large proportion of the cases where they now use plaster. Why it should be considered heresy to point out the advantages of the former, and urge its use, is a mystery, and yet such appears to be the case. A professor of prosthetic dentistry, whose name is known to dentists all over America, made the statement not long ago, that he dared not tell his students to what extent he uses the compound for taking impressions, and how seldom he uses plaster of Paris. The writer, however, although taught differently, has no hesitancy in stating his convictions that, taking all things into consideration, modelling compound is the better material, and that he rarely uses anything else in his practice, even for crown and bridge work.

In the first place, it is admitted by all that with the compound thoroughly softened, and at the proper temperature, an accurate impression with fine tracings can be obtained. The pressure necessary is not great, but is objected to by many because the soft parts yield readily, and are, therefore, compressed more than the roof of the mouth. This, instead of being an objection, is in reality an advantage. Under pressure the soft parts are forced into the