

# **Simeon in Luke 2:25-35: An “Archetypical Persona” for the Charisms of the Holy Spirit**

Ferdinand Chidiebere Odoh

## **Introduction**

The text of Luke 2:25-35, which carefully introduces Simeon as a special witness in the revelation of the identity of Jesus, also goes further to narrate how this Simeon was divinely guided to the Jerusalem temple at the right time in order to identify Jesus as God’s salvation, the Messiah, the son of God. Luke’s description of Simeon’s role in the identification of Jesus as God’s salvation in this passage focuses especially on Simeon’s relationship with God, evident in his constant interaction with the Holy Spirit. Simeon’s thoughts, actions and utterances in this passage are basically the thoughts, actions and utterances of the Holy Spirit. He is presented as a layman, a faithful Jew, a priest and a prophet. In fact, in this Lukan portrait, Simeon emerges as an archetypical persona for the charisms of the Holy Spirit.

## **Structure of the Text of Luke 2:25-35**

The structure of the above text shows a linear format when viewed in relation to Simeon’s role in identification of Jesus as God’s salvation

- Revelation of Simeon’s identity: vv.25-28a
- Simeon’s spirit uttered hymn of praise vv.28b-32
- Simeon’s spirit directed priestly role vv.33
- Simeon’s spirit uttered prophecy vv.34-35

## **Analysis of the Text of Luke 2:25-35**

### **Revelation of Simeon’s identity: vv.25-28a**

The text of Luke 2:25-28a focuses on Simeon’s personality. Although highly selective in its description of the personality of Simeon, this text tried to reveal the identity of Simeon, especially in respect to his

relationship to God in the spirit. In order to introduce this very special figure with a special mission of revealing the identity and mission of Jesus, Luke carefully began this descriptively narrative passage with the expression, “there was a man in Jerusalem.” This expression here is Luke’s style of introducing a new episode, personage, and context, and the use of the emphatic now stresses the importance of the episode, personage and context about to be described. In fact, it seems that for Luke, a worthy revealer of the saviour of the world must himself be an important and credible witness. Thus, the credentials of this witness or revealer, especially with reference to his relationship to God, are vital to Luke

For Luke’s purpose, the ancestral details of Simeon were not primary. What is clearly important to Luke is Simeon’s name and his relationship with God. This glossing over of the ancestral details of an important personage in this episode by Luke points to the fact that Luke’s narration is not a merely historical narration but a narration that is clearly tailored towards a given theological purpose. It is from Luke’s description of this man’s name and relationship with God that one can decipher whether he was a Jew in Jerusalem or a non-Jew in Jerusalem. Luke’s concern is Simeon’s credibility in becoming a worthy mouthpiece for God, one who would be able to announce the fulfilment of God’s plan in the child in the temple through a canticle (2:29-32) and an oracle (2:34-35).

Etymologically, the proper Jewish name Simeon (*Symeōn*) means, “God has heard.” It is a less common Jewish name than Simon (*Simōn*). It is not clear whether Luke’s narration here and his choice of the name is factual or theological. If theological, then the meaning of the name and its significance might have serious bearing on the role he would play in the entire event at the temple. As pointed out by Raymond Brown, the style of the Greek here indicates that an unknown person is being introduced to the reader; and this makes implausible the attempt to identify him as Simeon, the famous son of Hillel and father of Rabban Gamaliel, the elder.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 437.

However, the most popular etymology is said to have come from the Hebrew verb *šāma* ' , meaning "to hear." After giving birth to the Simeon in Gen 29:33, the mother was said to have, owing to the ugly situation imposed on her by her husband, exclaimed that God has given Simeon to her "because the Lord has heard (*šāma* ' ) that I am hated" (Gen 29:33).<sup>2</sup> Could it then be that Luke needed a personage, who was associated with consolation in order to identify the Lord's Christ, who is the consolation of Israel and light of revelation to the gentiles? As noted above, the primary concern of Luke may neither be on the etymology of the name Simeon nor on his socio-political antecedents, but rather on his religious and social standing with God and the people. In line with this, Luke went further to describe Simeon as a righteous and devout man.

**Simeon as a Righteous and devout Person.** ("And this man was righteous and devout," Luke 2:25)

Continuing his description of a seemingly mysterious figure Simeon, Luke states that he was "righteous" and "devout." The term *dikaios* (righteous, pious, saintly, holy) was also the same adjective used to describe the parents of John the Baptist in 1:6 and Joseph in Matt 1:19. In this way, Luke portrays the characters in the infancy narrative, who do not feature in the gospel story, as possessing the piety of Israel.<sup>3</sup> The New Testament usage of adjectival term *eulabes*, which denotes "careful in religious duties" (cf. *eulabeia*, Heb 5:7; 12:28), is confined solely to Luke-Acts. Although this term, "devout," has negative tone, "it is used here quite positively of a person who fulfilled the Jewish law."<sup>4</sup>

Simeon as a righteous and devout person must have a special significance for the role that he would play in this episode. Obviously, being righteous (*dikaios*) was basically associated with special reference to behaviour towards humans while being devout (*eulabes*) was used in reference to familial obligations and deity.<sup>5</sup> It is most probable, however, that the righteous person (*dikaios*) is also the person who fulfils

---

<sup>2</sup>Ringe H. Sharon, *Luke* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 26.

<sup>3</sup>Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 438.

<sup>4</sup>Howard I. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 118.

<sup>5</sup>Frederick William Danker, *Jesus and the New Age* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 2003 Print.

obligations to God and to the theocratic society. In fact, the term righteous has the following implications: (a) conforming to custom, (b) fulfilling obligation, and (c) observing legal norms. And there is also another aspect which pertains to ethical use whereby *dikaios*, having significance for the whole of life, relates to (d) the four cardinal virtues. So the description of Simeon as *dikaios kai eulabes* (righteous and devout) in Luke 2:25 refers probably to his obedience to God's law (*dikaios*) and to carefulness in performing religious duties.<sup>6</sup>

Luke has unique literary styles, one of which is his ability of pairing words, persons and events. This expression "righteous and devout" could be Luke's literary style of stating that Simeon was unimpeachable before God and the people. He was a man who could not be found wanting in his relationship with God and with neighbour. He was a man of balanced spirituality: neither obeying God to the detriment of peoples nor serving men in neglect or disregard to God. A person with these qualities may be Luke's ideal person who could become God's mouthpiece and instrument of revelation to reveal Jesus as God's salvation. In fact, this expression is undoubtedly a "*merismos*" because these two terms connote Simeon's charisma in both physical and spiritual realms.

### **Simeon as a Waiting Figure** ("Waiting for the Consolation of Israel" 2:25)

The description of Simeon as a waiting figure is another very important quality in Simeon that Luke would not like to ignore. The word *prosdekomenos* (a verb, present participle, middle, nominative, masculine, singular from *prosdekomai*) means "I await" (2:38; 23:51; Acts 23:21), "I receive" or "I welcome" (12:36; 15:2f.; Acts 24:15f.). Hence, Simeon was described as "waiting," ready "to welcome" or "to receive" something. He was expectant of a special divine action that would fulfil a promise. It is a promise that has, in this context, both personal and communal significance.

The term *paraklesin* here means "comfort" or "consolation." It has the import of Isaiah 40; and it refers to the consolation brought about by the messianic era. In the view of François Bovon, *paraklesin* (consolation)

---

<sup>6</sup>Sharon, *Luke*, 26.

here has an unmistakable eschatological tenor; its meaning in the context of religion is “consolation.”<sup>7</sup> Like Anna the prophetess and her audience in v.38, Simeon is a “waiting” figure. He hopes in God, not for himself but for the people of Israel. So, “waiting for the consolation of Israel” is an expression adopted by Luke that is very striking. For Bovon, Simeon’s waiting for the consolation of Israel shows that “belief in Christ is the legitimate answer to the legitimate expectation of the Jews.”<sup>8</sup>

In line with the above, Luke, in Luke 23:50-51, describes Joseph of Arimathea as “good and upright... waiting for the kingdom of God.” Hence, Luke sees Simeon as a pre-ministry equivalence of Joseph of Arimathea. Another parallel for this description of Simeon is found in Luke’s characterization of the circle to whom Anna proclaimed her message: “all those waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem” (Luke 2:38).<sup>9</sup> The grammatical construction in the phrase *paraklesin tou Israelas* noted by Smith is such that the absence of the article with a concrete and determinate substantive cannot be insisted upon e.g. *peuma theou*(Rom 8:9) or *to pneuma tou theou*(1Cor 3:16).<sup>10</sup> In our context, we have *paraklesin tou Israel*, whose substantive is without article and the following genitive has an article. In this case, the omission of article for the substantive or the addition of article for the genitive makes it a unique construction, which points to a Semitic influence. By it, Luke seems to be articulating the fulfilment of an expectation that has Jewish colouration.

Obviously, Luke classifies Simeon as one of those Israelites, who was waiting for the consolation of Israel. The expression “consolation of Israel” is found in prophetic literature in reference to the promise of Israel’s restoration (cf. Jer 38:9 LXX). But a more specific context for the gospel of Luke seems to be in Isaiah where it often becomes a symbol for the arrival of the eschatological era when God fulfils his promises to

---

<sup>7</sup>François Bovon, *Luke 1:1- 9:50*, Trans. By Christine M. Thomas (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 100.

<sup>8</sup>Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 100.

<sup>9</sup>Brown, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 438.

<sup>10</sup>Joseph Smith, *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples* (Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1965), 59.

Israel (Isa 28:29; 30:7; 57:18; 66:11). The verbal form *parakaleo* appears more than twenty-five times in Isaiah, and Isa 40:1-11 can be considered as a summary of this message of consolation when the eschatological second exodus is expressed through the several appearances of *parakaleo* (Isa 40: 1, 2, 11). In Isa 66:13 (LXX), the concept of consolation still holds sway: “As one whom a mother consoles, so also shall I console you, and you will be consoled in Jerusalem.” In fact, Sabourin concludes that Simeon’s hope can easily be linked with that which inspired other pious people to whom Anna spoke to about the child Jesus (v.38).<sup>11</sup>

In fact, for Luke, the “consolation of Israel” referred not merely to the “fulfilment of Jewish political hopes involving deliverance from their enemies and restoration of David’s throne, but rather to the salvation Jesus brought. It is the consolation that would be brought about by the inauguration of the “messianic age.”<sup>12</sup> Like other devout model believers (Anna, 2:38; Joseph of Arimathean, 23:51; cf. also 12:36; Act 24:15), Simeon was looking forward to Israel’s consolation (2:25); i.e., Jerusalem’s redemption (2:38); the coming of God’s kingdom (23:51); the master’s return (12:36); the resurrection of the just and the unjust (Acts 24:15).<sup>13</sup>

**The Holy Spirit was upon him** (“And the Holy Spirit was upon him,” 2:25)

The description of Simeon by Luke attains its climax when Luke points out that the Holy Spirit was upon him. The word order, *pneuma ēn hagian*, is indeed not a usual one. It has no article and the adjective is separated from the noun by the verb *ēn*. Brown contends that this is an anarthrous construction, which is also evident in Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67 and also in Matt 1:18, 20.<sup>14</sup> But according to Marshall, this type of word arrangement in a sentence is basically for emphasis.<sup>15</sup> In the next verse, the article is used. But the use with the article in the next verse made Brown to suggest that Luke is here “thinking of the Holy Spirit, even

---

<sup>11</sup>Leopold Sabourin, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: Introduction and Commentary* (Bandra, Bombay: Saint Paul Society, 1984), 101.

<sup>12</sup>Robert Stein, *Luke*, New American Commentary 24 (Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 115.

<sup>13</sup>Stein, *Luke*, 115.

<sup>14</sup>Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 438.

<sup>15</sup>Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 118.

though we cannot be certain whether Luke thinks of the pre-Christian gift of the spirit as somewhat different from the post-resurrectional gift.”<sup>16</sup> The seemingly irregular use of *epi* here is in line with its use in 4:18 and goes on to emphasize the fact that the spirit is here the inspirer of prophecy. In line with this, Marshall says that Simeon is thus one whose “hopes would be fulfilled by the coming of the Messiah; he was now equipped to recognize the coming of the Messiah and to speak prophetically about it by the fact that ‘the Holy Spirit was upon him’.”<sup>17</sup> And according to Brown, the use of *pneuma agion* in the very next verse is an indication that Luke was also thinking of the Holy Spirit here and not that an influence which was holy was upon him as suggested by Sharon.<sup>18</sup>

But the question here is, was Simeon righteous and devout because the Holy Spirit was upon him or was the Holy Spirit upon him because he was righteous and devout? For David Garland, “Zechariah and Elizabeth were identified for being righteous. Only later did the Holy Spirit come upon them so that they could prophesy and praise God. Simeon is able to prophesy now because of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>19</sup> So, righteousness could be said to be a necessary fruit of divine grace which nourishes the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. Obviously, when the Holy Spirit is upon someone, prophetic utterances could be anticipated. In view of this, the Lukan description of Simeon as “righteous and devout,” “waiting for the consolation of Israel,” and “the Holy Spirit was upon him” was in preparation for the praise of God and prophecy that would come forth from his mouth. The detailed description is simply meant to identify and prove that Simeon is a worthy mouthpiece for God since he is able to meet the essential conditions for the spirit-oriented prophecy.

**Simeon as a Recipient of Divine Revelation in Theory** (“And it had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit,” 2:26)

---

<sup>16</sup>Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 438

<sup>17</sup>Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 118.

<sup>18</sup>Sharon, *Luke*, 27.

<sup>19</sup>David E. Garland, *Luke*, Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Ed. Clinton E. Arnold (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011), 135.

The word *kechrēmatismenon* is the perfect participle, passive, nominative, neuter, singular of the verb *chrēmatisō*, which means, “I reveal, instruct, answer, warn.” The word *kechrēmatismenon* is better translated “has been revealed.” This is the passive of an intransitive verb. The verb involves a divine oracle or response. For instance, in Acts 10:22, it is used for the direction of Cornelius by an angel.<sup>20</sup> “The use of the passive suggests a revelation by God and in the OT the corresponding Hebrew term represented here by *kechrēmatismenon* indicated some form of direct revelation from God (Jer 25:30; 33:2; Job 40:88).”<sup>21</sup> The use of perfect participle passive *kechrēmatismenon* here indicates that there had been an encounter between Simeon and the Holy Spirit prior to this temple episode. The Holy Spirit did not just start guiding and influencing Simeon’s actions, speeches and thought from the temple, but had always done so. It was in the earlier encounter that this Holy Spirit gave Simeon a revelation. The setting for the earlier revelation (encounter between Simeon and the Holy Spirit) was not important to Luke and so he went straight to state the content of the revelation. Some scholars however argue that since the Holy Spirit was constantly guiding Simeon by being upon him, it is more likely that it was in a dream that Simeon got the revelation.<sup>22</sup> The term *kechrēmatismenon* has also the following senses; “to transact business,” “to give a divine response to one who consults an oracle” and “to give a divine admonition, teach from heaven” (cf. Jer 25:30; 31:2; Job 40:8). The passive is used both of the admonition divinely given, as here, and of the person divinely admonished (cf. Matt 2:12; Acts 10:22; Heb 8:5; 11:17).<sup>23</sup>

**Simeon as a Charismatic *par excellence*** (“And he came in the spirit into the temple,” 2:27)

The word *ēlthen* (“he came” 2:27) is an aorist active indicative of *erchomai* that corresponds with the aorist active indicative of *anago* in verse 22 (*anēgagon* “they went up”) and makes the encounter possible. Although the phrase *en tō pneumatī*(2:27) has been taken to mean “in an

<sup>20</sup>Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 438.

<sup>21</sup>Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 438.

<sup>22</sup>Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, International Critical Commentary (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), 66.

<sup>23</sup>Plummer, *Luke*, 66.



ecstasy” as in Rev 1:10, Marshall argues that the presence of the article and the context suggest that he came into the temple by the guidance of the spirit (4:1).<sup>24</sup> Luke presents the encounter as one prepared for by God. The divine guidance made it possible for Simeon to be in the temple when the parents of Jesus brought him into the temple courtyard.

After a tacit enunciation of the content of the revelation to Simeon in v.26, Luke now locates Simon in the temple where the main episode would take place. Notice that every action of Simeon is spirit-directed. Even his coming into the temple at this most auspicious moment is not by accident but directed by the Holy Spirit in order to ensure the fulfilment of the divine promise to him. Hence, Luke states “he came in the spirit into the temple.” Luke’s initial description of Simeon as the one whom the Holy Spirit was upon already points to the fact that whatever he does or would do in the context of this narrative would be directed by the spirit. So, this statement in verse 27, “he came in the spirit into the temple,” is basically to highlight the role that Simeon would play as divinely ordained. Since the Holy Spirit was upon Simeon and he also came in the Spirit into the temple, whatever Simeon would do or say in this temple would not be mere words of Simeon but that of the Holy Spirit that has brought him to be part, and especially, the essential part of this event. In this way, Luke continues to x-ray the vital role of the Holy Spirit in the salvific mission of God. Notice that up till now Simeon has not uttered a word. And when he would speak, it would be the spirit, which has been upon him and which led him into the temple that would be speaking through him.

**Simeon as a Recipient of Divine Revelation Practically** (“He took him up in his arms” 2:28).

Luke had his attention shifted to the encounter between Jesus and Simeon who is by all available facts a non-priest/levite. Obviously, the narrative from vv. 22 to 27 has been an attempt to bring Jesus and Simeon together in an encounter that would reveal the identity of the child, which is the main purpose of the narration. The account of the presentation and purification, which is undeniably too sketchy and probably incorrectly presented, was simply meant to bring Jesus and his

---

<sup>24</sup>Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 119.

parents to the temple in such a way that even when it was not obligatory for the child to be present, Luke did ensure that Jesus was present because the purpose of Luke is being dressed in a garb of presentation. The primary concern of Luke is the unveiling of the identity of Jesus and the nature of his mission, which would be clearly and succinctly presented in the canticle and the oracle of Simeon in vv.29-32 and 34-35, respectively. Having brought Jesus and Simeon, who is an embodiment of righteousness, piety, Holy Spirit and expectant Israel together through a narrative that is purely selective, now comes the climax of the narration, which would detail Luke's purpose.

Marshall observes that "the word *agkalas* from *agkalē* is basically used of the arm when bent to receive something."<sup>25</sup> And Brown noted that it was on the basis of this text that Christian hagiography identifies Simeon as *Theodokos* (God-receiver).<sup>26</sup> Simeon does not "take" the child, but "receives" him in his bent arms *eis tas agkalas*(2:28). The divine oracle is fulfilled, not only by "seeing" (vv.26, 30), but in "touching." The relationship between Simeon and Jesus is a microcosm of the relationship between the messianic expectation of the people of Israel and its fulfilment.<sup>27</sup> Simeon received Jesus in his arms (*agkalē*) but in 4:24 Jesus says with the same verb, *dekomai*(to receive) that no prophet is received or welcomed (*dektos* 4:24) in his own country. Obviously, the theme of the reception of Jesus, of his message, and of his disciples is central in the gospel of Luke (8:13; 9; 5, 48, 53; 10:8, 10; 18:17). Hence, Bovon went further to state that "Jesus' reception by Simeon is a global behaviour and attitude, in which the entire person of Simeon, his body and inner self, his thought and feelings became active."<sup>28</sup>

The proper and full activation of the entire person of Simeon for the efficient discharge of the divine mandate is only possible through the divine action of the Holy Spirit. Note also that at this point in the encounter between Jesus and Simeon, the action is kept to essentials: greetings and exchange of pleasantries are not important (unlike 1:40-41).

---

<sup>25</sup>Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 119.

<sup>26</sup>Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 439.

<sup>27</sup>Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 101.

<sup>28</sup>Bovon, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 101.

### **Simeon's Priestly and Prophetic Role:**

The expression “blessed God” (*eulogesen ton theon* in 2:28) is reminiscent of a priestly prayer that pertains to a thanksgiving prayer. The word “bless” (*eulogesen*) may appear a very difficult term in the current English usage. To bless is a priestly action but to praise is a general word that brings out clearly what is in the *NuncDimittis*.

The use of the same word *eulogesen* in v. 33 for blessing “them” (probably the parents) also raises the question of whether Simeon was a priest. But it is better understood as praising the parents for accepting the enormous task of being the parent of a Messiah, who would be rejected by most of his kin. In the present context of praising God in 2:28, Simeon praised God for fulfilling his promises to him and to Israel. And it is the duty of anyone who receives fulfilment of divine promise to praise God for such. So, the phrase “and said” points out that the following canticle is the praises that Simeon rendered to God. It is a praise that articulates what God has done for him and his people and how completely grateful and satisfied he is for receiving such a divine favour. Used in its proper context and meaning, *eulogeō* can suppose priestly powers, as when the risen Christ blessed his disciples (Luke 24:50), but not necessarily, since the patriarchs did bless their sons without being priests (Gen 27 and 48; cf. Heb 11:21). In Luke 2:34, Simeon's blessing can, however, be understood in the broader sense of expressing congratulations or wishes.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, Simeon addressed his words to Mary rather than to Mary and Joseph. This may be because Mary's unique relationship to Jesus due to the virginal conception or due to Joseph's death pre-dating the crucifixion, so that a sword could not pierce his soul.<sup>30</sup> But it seems, however, that Simeon's blessing Joseph and Mary is reminiscent of a similar episode in Samuel (1 Sam 2:20-21). Set within this narrative context, “it must refer to the divine fortune they share in their role as

---

<sup>29</sup>Sabourin, *St. Luke*, 103.

<sup>30</sup>Stein, *Luke*, 116.

parents of him who already occupies so central a role in God's salvific aim."<sup>31</sup>

### **The Charisms of the Holy Spirit in the Life of Simeon**

Simeon manifested, in full, the charisms of the Holy Spirit. Luke indicated this by using his unique literary expression "righteous and devout, and waiting for the consolation of Israel," which summarizes Simeon's charisms with which he related with both God and people. The expression "righteous and devout" could be said to be a "*merismos*," which contains within it all the requisite charisms in physical and spiritual realm. In order to avoid endless listings, Luke summarized all the charisms that Simeon needed to accomplish his mission with the above "*merismos*" (righteous and devout). In socio-cultural *cum* political affairs, Simeon was impeccable and in religio-spiritual matters, he showed total commitment evident in his being described as devout.

The expression "waiting for the consolation of Israel" shows that Simeon was a patriotic Israelite, who was totally dependent on God. In fact, the Holy Spirit was upon him in such a way that all his actions and utterances in this passage were prompted and guided by the Holy Spirit. It is worthy of note and hence very striking that Simeon, despite possessing all the charisms of the Holy Spirit as explicated above, kept walking within the limits of both divine and natural law. He remained available to God and the people. He remained humble and obedient. He remained a reliable instrument or mouthpiece of God. He still saw himself as God's slave/servant and God as his Master. He remained authentic in his prophetic utterances and was ready to be called a prophet of doom rather than being an inauthentic prosperity prophet. What a man of sublime charisms and authentically balanced spirituality?

### **Juxtaposition of Simeon and Contemporary Christians**

From the foregoing, it is obvious that Simeon was merely a simple, righteous, devout, hopeful and patriotic Jew, who was chosen and then prepared by God to experience and to bear witness to the fulfilment of God's salvific plan in Jesus. The personality of Simeon, x-rayed in his

---

<sup>31</sup>Joel B. Green. *The Gospel of Luke*, New International Commentary of the New Testament(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 147.

relationship with God evident in his encounter with the Holy Spirit, presents before us a simple, faithful, mature, selfless and dedicated individual whose fulfilment and contentment is based on the actualization of God's salvific plan for his people. He was contented to play his divinely assigned role and after that role he retired happily

Contemporary Christians are becoming weary of wearing the garb of righteousness, devoutness, patience, hope, faith, selflessness, service and charity. Simeon waited patiently for the fulfilment of God's promises and in the course of his waiting, he remained steadfastly righteous and devout such that when the time for the fulfilment of God's promises came, he was not found wanting. Some contemporary Christians who are endowed with charisms of the Holy Spirit invent their own laws and become gods rather than servants. At such points, it is God who should look for them and not otherwise. And rather than becoming authentic and reliable mouthpiece of God, they become mouthpieces of their own ego and sentiments

### **Conclusion**

Luke, in 2:25-35, presents to us a model for the charisms of the Holy Spirit. As the textual analysis has shown, Simeon is an embodiment of the charisms of the Holy Spirit and Luke presents Simeon to us as an ideal model to his fellow humanity. Luke expects us to see Simeon as a repertoire of condensed spirituality, a rare gem in missionary witnessing, an epitome of prophetic exuberance and a bastion of Christian fidelity.