

of penetrating neck trauma based on cervical level of injury. *Am J Surg* 1997;174:678-82.

11. Meyer JP, Barret JA, Schuller JJ, Flanigan P. Mandatory vs selective exploration for penetrating neck trauma. *Arch Surg* 1987;122:592-7.

“Will for equal opportunity stronger than the wish to die?”

To the Editor:

I recently had the opportunity to review an article for IMAJ that shared with us aspects from the valuable experience that the author had acquired along the years. On reading it, some of my personal experience came to mind. One story in particular – depicting aspects of the controversial issue of “The patient’s wish for the Exit Option” – seems more actual now than ever.

Many years ago, during my early residency, I took care of a 40 year old painter with advanced multiple sclerosis that struck him at the peak of a successful career. He was completely paralyzed except for some movement of the neck muscles that enabled him to move his head back and forth. We accepted him from a nursing home, where he had been placed by his wife after she had sold his most valuable paintings ...

We attempted some rehabilitation by fixing him a wheelchair with a special device operated by the movements of the head, making it possible for him to look at picture albums. He had a clear mind and a sharp intelligence, and we soon became friends beyond the usual doctor-patient relationship. We used to have long talks about his condition. During those talks he expressed again and again his wish to die. He even asked me to give him a shot and bring his “meaningless life” to an end.

One morning he suddenly complained of chest pain. We diagnosed an acute myocardial infarction and informed him about it. His reaction was astonishing – he raised his voice and demanded to be immediately transferred to the intensive coronary unit; otherwise, he said, it

means we are discriminating against him and he would sue us! He was transferred to the ICU, returned after several days, completed his rehabilitation and went back to the nursing home as mentally competent as he had come to us.

I learned then that even when a patient clearly expresses the wish to die, he or she does not always really mean it. Seemingly, this patient’s sense for equal opportunity overcame his wish to die. Ever since, when encountering the subject of “patients’ wish to die,” I tell this story to my students, making it the starting point for an ethical dispute.

Beni Habot MD

Director, Shmuel Harofe Hospital
Geriatric Medical Center
Tel Aviv, Israel

Moses Maimonides was born in 1138, not 1135 C.E.

To the Editor:

Moses Maimonides is the most illustrious figure in Judaism in the post-Talmudic era and one of the greatest of all times. He was famous as a rabbi, philosopher, physician, legal codifier, theologian, astronomer, mathematician, ethicist and much more. It is widely accepted that he was born on 30 March 1135, corresponding to Passover eve, Saturday the fourteenth day of Nissan in the year 4895 of the Hebrew calendar.

The nearly universal acceptance of 1135 as the year in which Maimonides was born has recently been challenged. Convincing evidence is now available that the correct date of his birth is 1138 and not 1135. The evidence that 1138 is the correct date is based on at least two autograph manuscripts of Moses Maimonides’ Mishnah Commentary, at the end of which the great sage clearly states that he was thirty years old when he completed his commentary in the year 1168 (1479 Sel.). Thus, he was born in the year 1138.

The incorrect assumption that he was born in 1135 is based on several manu-

script fragments whose authors are unknown and who perpetuated several errors and confusion of dates from a single early manuscript. These errors and inconsistencies are detailed by several recent scholars [1-5] who reject the suggestions by earlier writers that corrections of these “scribal errors” be made to fit the notion that Maimonides was born in 1135. These recent scholars [1-5] prove definitively that Maimonides was born in 1138 and not in 1135 as was previously thought.

The words of Maimonides himself in his autographs are the strongest proof of the accuracy of 1138 as his birth year. Primary sources from early authentic manuscripts are much more authoritative than the unclear, deficient fragments of manuscripts written by unknown authors and replete with errors and inconsistencies. The latter were perpetuated for centuries until Sassoon, Havlin and Goitein called attention to the Maimonides autograph of his Mishnah Commentary in which Maimonides states that he was thirty years old in the year 1168 when he completed his commentary and was thus born in the year 1138 of the Common Era.

Fred Rosner MD FACP

Mount Sinai Services at Queens Hospital
Center and The
Mount Sinai School of Medicine
New York, USA

References

1. Sassoon S. Introduction to Maimonides Commentarius in Mischnam (R. Edelman, ed). Vol. 1. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1956:1-54.
2. Kapach J. Mishnah im Pirush Rabbenu Moshe Ben Maimon. Seder Tohorot, 5728 (1968) Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook.
3. Goitein SD. Moses Maimonides, Man of Action. A Revision of the Master’s Biography in Light of the Geniza Documents. In: Hommage a Georges Vajda (G. Nahon and C. Touati, eds), Louvain: Editions Peeters, 1980:155-67.
4. Kahana K. Taarich Ledato Upetirato Shel HaRambam, in Jubilee volume in memory of Yom Tob ben Abraham Al Ishbili (HaRitva). Jerusalem 5716 (1956):71-5.
5. Havlin SZ. Letoldot HaRambam, Daat (A Journal of Jewish Philosophy & Kabbalah), No. 15, Summer 1985:67-79.