Deut. vii. 9; Judg. v. 31; Neh. i. 5;  
Ps. v. 11, exliv. 20; Dan. ix. 4; Ecclus.  
xxxi. [xxxiv.] 16, xlvii. 22).

**13, 14.**] {13} **Let no one when tempted** (in the manner  
hitherto spoken of through the chapter.  
There is no warrant for changing in the  
slightest degree the reference of the word.  
The *temptation* is a trying of the man by  
the solicitation of evil: whether that evil  
be the terror of external danger, or whatever  
it be, all *temptation* by means of it  
arises not from God, but from ourselves  
—our own *lust*. God ordains the temptation,  
overrules the temptation, but does  
not tempt, is not the spring of the solicitation  
to sin) **say that I am tempted from**[*by*] **God** (by agency proceeding out and  
coming from God: very different from  
“*of God,*” which would represent God as  
the agent. Thus the man would transfer  
his own responsibility to God. There does  
not seem to be any allusion to the fatalism  
of the Pharisees, as some seem to think: the  
fault is one of common life, and is alluded  
to Ecclus. xv. 11, “*Say not thou, It is  
through the Lord that I fell away”*):  
**for God is unversed in things evil** (the  
meaning usually given, “*untempted,*” or  
“*not able to be tempted,*” is against the  
usage of the word. Besides, there is no  
question here of God *being tempted*, but  
of God *tempting*. It seems that we must  
take refuge in the ordinary meaning of  
the word, and render it ‘*unversed in,*’  
having no experience of), **but HE tempteth  
no man: {14} but each man is tempted, being**  
(slightly causal, ‘in that he is’) **drawn out  
and enticed by** (it is the same preposition  
in the Greek as above, ver. 13: the source  
rather than the agent : but we cannot here  
render it *from*, as the sentence would thus  
become ambiguous) **his own lust** (James  
is not here speaking of the *original* source  
of sin in man, but of the actual source of  
temptation to sin, when it occurs. The  
“*sin*” of St. Paul, the sinful principle in  
man, is not here in question: we take  
up the matter, so to speak, lower down  
the stream: and the *lust* here is the *lust*  
there, itself the effect of sin [abstr.] in  
the members, and leading to sin [concrete]  
in the conduct):

**15.**] **then lust  
having conceived, bringeth forth sin:  
and sin, when completed, bringeth forth  
death** (it has been questioned whether  
**sin** is here in one, or in two senses.  
De Wette holds that the first **sin** is the  
purpose, or inner act, of sin,—the *completion*,  
carrying this *sin* out into an act,  
which act brings forth death, the wages  
of sin. But this is decidedly wrong.  
Wiesinger has disputed it, and insisted  
rightly that the *inner act* is the union  
of the will with the *lust*, the “*bringing  
forth*” denoting extrusion into outward  
act: then the second *sin*,—which Huther  
rightly maintains to be the sinful act when  
brought to perfection in all its consequences,  
in a series of results following on  
one another and bringing a man under  
bondage to his sin,—being thus perfected,  
brings forth eternal death. The imagery  
is throughout consistent. The harlot **lust  
draws away** and **entices** the man: the  
guilty union is committed by the will embracing  
the temptress: the consequence is  
that she **conceives sin**, sin, in general, of  
some kind, of that kind to which the temptation  
inclines : then [so literally], **the sin**,  
that particular sin, when grown up and  
mature, herself **bringeth forth**, as if all  
along pregnant with it, Death, the final result  
of sin. So that *temptation to sin* cannot  
be from God, while *trial* is from Him. The  
one, being our proof, works endurance, and  
endurance, when she has a perfect work,  
life: the other, being a bait and excitement  
arising from lust, “brings forth sin,  
and sin being completed, brings forth  
**death.**” The English reader will not fail  
to remember Milton’s sublime allegory  
in Paradise Lost, where Satan, by his