

and journeyed not, but when it was taken up they journeyed (not clear)

~~xxxx~~ now that English translation is not an incorrect translation, but it does not give the full meaning of the original. I think you could give it more accurately with a little different Eng<sup>o</sup> translation. These verbs used here, ~~it~~ "it tarried upon the tabernacle," "they abode in their tents," "they journeyed not," "when it was taken up they journeyed;" all those verbw verbs are in the imperfect. They are all in the imperfect, and our usual translation of the imperfect is a future: "When it will be taken up they will journey." "Where "When (?) it will remain they will stay." I don't believe it should be translated as future, though; I believe it is a free (?) (pleasantive(?) ) which is a rather common use of the imperfect, not nearly as common as its use for future. (not clear) and yet it occurs a great many times in the OT<sup>o</sup>. That is to say, "When it would do this, then, they they would do so-and-so." "When it would do that they would do that." In other words, that if the Lord would cause the cloud to be over there for a period of time they would definitely stay. If the Lord would cause the cloud to move from there and go before them, they would definitely go. But there might be long periods of time in which this pillar <sup>was</sup> of cloud/~~xxxx~~ not visible ~~xxxx~~ to them. That is certainly a possibility ~~xx~~ that it appeared at special times at (in) special circumstances. We do no have a great many references in the history to the cloud being appearing specifically or to the cloud moving specifically. We do have a few of them We have perhaps a larger number of references to the cloud as being an instrument of God's revelation, like in Num. 16:42, where you read, "And it came to pass, when the/~~xxxx~~ <sup>congregation</sup> was gathered against Moses and against Aaron, that they looked toward the tabernacle of the congregation: and, behold, the cloud covered it, and the glory of the LORD appeared." That gives the impression that they had not been able to see this <sup>during</sup> in the period before they looked, and they saw that this happened. (sounded like "happens") It doesn't prove