It most probably is, that the Evangelist  
omitted what was ordinary, but stated  
what was doubtful or singular. It has  
been suggested, that as these women are  
of Gentile origin or dubious character,  
they may be mentioned as introducing the  
calling of Gentiles and sinners by our  
Lord: also, that they may serve as types  
of the mother of our Lord, and are consequently named in the course of the genealogy, as she is at the end of it.

**5. Rachab**] It has been imagined, on chronological grounds, that this Rachab must  
be a different person from Rahab of Jericho. But those very grounds completely  
tally with their identity. For Naashon  
father of Salmon), prince of Judah (1  
Chron. ii. 10), offered his offering at the  
setting up of the tabernacle (Num. vii. 12)  
39 years before the taking of Jericho. So  
that Salmon would be of mature age at  
or soon after that event; at which time  
Rahab was probably young, as her father  
and mother were living (Josh. vi. 23). Nor  
is it any objection that Achan, the fourth  
in descent from Judah by Zara, is contemporary with Salmon, the sixth of the other  
branch: since the generations in the line  
of Zara average 69 years, and those in the  
line of Phares 49, both within the limits of  
probability. The difficulty of the interval  
of 366 years between Rahab and David  
does not to this passage only, but  
equally to Ruth iv. 21, 22; and is by no  
means insuperable, especially when the extreme old age of Jesse, implied in 1 Sam.  
xvii. 12, is considered.—I may add that,  
considering Rahab’s father and mother  
were alive, the house would hardly be  
called *the house Of Rahab* except on account of the character commonly assigned  
to her.

**8. Joram ... Ozias**] Three  
kings, viz. Ahaziah, Joash, Amaziah  
(1 Chron. iii. 11, 12), are here omitted.  
Some think that they were erased on account of their connexion, by means of  
Athaliah, with the accursed house of Ahab.  
Simeon is omitted by Moses in blessing the  
tribes (Deut. xxxiii.): the descendants of  
Zebulun and Dan are over in  
1 Chron., and none of the latter tribe are  
sealed in Rev. vii. But more probably  
such erasion, even if justifiable by that  
reason, was not made on account of it, but  
for convenience, in order to square the  
numbers of the different portions of the  
genealogies, as here. Compare, as illustrating such omissions, 1 Chron. viii. 1 with Gen. xlvi. 21.

**11. Josias . . .  
Jechonias**] Eliakim, son of Josiah and  
father of Jechonias, is omitted ; which was  
objected to the Christians by Porphyry.  
The reading which inserts Joacim (i.e.  
Eliakim) rests on hardly any foundation,  
and would make fifteen generations in the  
second “*fourteen.*” The solution of the  
difficulty by supposing the name to apply  
to both Eliakim and his son, and to mean  
the former in ver. 11 and the latter in ver.  
12, is unsupported by example, and contrary to the usage of the genealogy. When we notice that the *brethren* of Jechonias  
are his *uncles*, and find this way of speaking sanctioned by 2 Chron. xxxvi. 10, where Zedekiah, one of these, is called his brother,  
we are led to seek our solution in some  
manner of speaking of these kings, by which Eliakim and his son were not accounted two distinct generations. If we compare 1 Chron. iii. 16 with 2 Kings