must be taken in *some other than the Jewish sense;* and  
that sense doubtless is the one suggested.  
 It is certain that the “*coming out of*” the Tribulation  
*implies a previous sojourn in it*. See the passages in  
which a like expression occurs: Matt. xi. 43; Mark ix. 7;   
Luke v. 17; xi. 24; John iv. 30; viii. 59; xiii. 3.  
 We are next enlightened concerning the whiteness of  
the robes of the saved. It was due to a washing in the  
Lamb’s blood. The doctrine of the imputation of  
Christ’s righteousness to the believer is a blessed truth;  
but it is not the one taught here. Christ’s robe is one;  
here “robes” are spoken of in the plural. These robes  
were defiled, and needed cleansing. That of Christ does  
not: much less does it need the saints’ cleansing of it.  
Besides which, the robes are said to be “theirs.” “They  
washed *their* robes.” They were guilty of various faults,  
as Jesus’ seven messages to the churches prove. But  
*they owned them*, and *removed them by Jesus’ blood*. What  
is intimated, then, in this passage is, that the good deeds  
of these believers are accepted before God on the ground  
of the atonement of Christ.  
 Now they are washed, to be unclean no more; having  
put on incorruption, and escaped out of the region of  
temptation. *Their bodies also are now clean: they have  
risen from the dead.*  
 They “made their robes white in the blood of the  
Lamb.” It was not their own blood, shed in martyrdom,  
that gave them that snowy hue. But “the  
Fathers,” so called, dare to contradict this. Says  
Aretas, “*We affirm then that the shedding of their blood for  
Christ’s sake delivered them from every stain! For being  
baptized in their own blood, they came up white from such a  
laver* to Christ their king, just like the lambs in Solomon’s  
Song, who come up white from the washing.” “Having  
washed,” says Berengaud, “their robes *in baptism*, and  
also by *repentance and acts of mercy*.” *Beware of* “*the*