ANGLO-TURKISH EXPEDITION AGAINST THE CHA'B ARABS
OF THE SHAT EL ARAB.

I should be much obliged for any information as to an Anglo-Turkish expedition against the Cha'b Arabs about the year 1767, or as to where such information could be obtained.

In the Cha'b tribal MS. it says: "1180 occurred the siege by Mohamed Kakhiah and Mr. Zabeida the Frangi, 6th Rabia'-el-Awal."

In Dean Vincent's "Nearchus" it says: "He (Sheikh Salmān) was afterwards involved in a quarrel with the English on account of two considerable vessels which he had taken."

A note to this in the second edition by Sir H. Jones says: "The Dawrack stream was injured by the Cháb Sheikh when he was besieged in the year 1767 (I believe) by the combined forces of the Turks and English."

According to the Arabs, the expedition was a failure, and the European Abu Tawq died, and his grave exists at Felahiah in Daurakistan, Persian Arabia, as also the remains of his earthworks. He was called Abu Tawq because he fought with a gold ring round his neck.

W. McDouall.

Bidborough, Tunbridge Wells.
Nov. 21st, 1903.

THE LAI DIALECT.

In the *Lai* dialect of the Chin tribes living in the hills on the Burma-Manipur frontier, there is a curious use of the personal pronouns that seems worthy of record in our Journal.

The *Lai* is absolutely monosyllabic, all relations being expressed by position, by composition, or, most generally, by prefixes and suffixes.

Each personal pronoun has a full and an abbreviated form; they are—

kéma (*ka* or *k'*) = I.

nangma (*na* or *n'*) = thou or you.

amma (*an* or *a*) = he, she, or it.

Now every finite verb must invariably have prefixed to it an abbreviated form of that personal pronoun which is of the same person as its subject, no matter whether the subject itself is or is not otherwise expressed. If the subject is a noun, then the noun comes early in the sentence; but prefixed to the verb near the end must be the abbreviated form of the third personal pronoun. If the subject is a pronoun, then the longer form of that pronoun may come early in the sentence or may be omitted altogether; but in either case the abbreviated form of the pronoun must be prefixed to the verb near the end.

Thus it is right to say :—

<i>Nangma</i>	<i>zé</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>n'</i>	<i>du ?</i>	} = What do you want?
You	what	you	want?		
<i>Zé</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>n'</i>	<i>du ?</i>		
What	you	want?			

<i>Kéma</i>	<i>shî</i>	<i>k'</i>	<i>du</i>	} = I want medicine.
I	medicine	I	want	
<i>Shî</i>	<i>k'</i>	<i>du</i>		
Medicine	I	want		

<i>Shî</i>	<i>Boi-pa</i>	<i>shî</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>pék</i>	<i>lai</i>	} = The doctor will give (you) medicine.
Medicine	master	medicine	he	give	will	

<i>Amma</i>	<i>shî</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>pék</i>	<i>lai</i>	} = He will give (—) medicine.
He	medicine	he	give	will	
<i>Shî</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>pék</i>	<i>lai</i>		
Medicine	he	give	will		

But each of the following forms would be incorrect :—

Nangma zé da du ?
Zé da nangma du ?

Kéma shî du.
Shî kéma du.

Shî Boi-pa shî pék lai.

Amma shî pék lai.
Shî amma pék lai.

TABLETS PRESERVED IN THE ZIARAT OF ZĀHIDĀN.

The abbreviated form of the personal pronoun is thus seen to be as essentially a part of the *Lai* finite verb as the 'personal endings' are of Sanskrit or Latin verbs.

H. H. TILBE.

INSCRIPTIONS FROM SISTAN.

I send by this mail two photographs which may interest the Society; one is of some tablets that are deposited in the Ziarat, or shrine of the 44 Pirs of Zāhidān (Chihil-o-chahār Pir-i-Zāhidān). The inscriptions on the tablets are very clear, and refer to Fakirs who lived in past ages. I at one time thought that perhaps the inscriptions might have reference to the Maliks of Sistan, but I was disappointed. There are several of these tablets at the Ziarat, only two of which have been photographed.

The shrine is situated within the limits of the ancient town of Zāhidān, destroyed by Taimur in the month of Shawāl, 785 H. It is surrounded by ruins of houses and heaps of débris, in which lie the skeletons of an innumerable multitude of human beings, victims of the general slaughter decreed by the conqueror.

The other photograph is of the ruined minaret known, from the modern hamlet of Kāsamabad which is close to it, as the Mil-i-kāsamabād. The minaret is beautifully constructed of baked bricks, set in the cement which the Persians call sārūj or sārūnj. It is 75 feet in height now, and stands on a square plinth, each side of which is 18 feet square. The diameter of the minaret is therefore 18 feet. The ruins of a staircase exist within the shaft. The inscriptions and ornamentation of the minaret can be clearly seen in the picture. The plinth is 1 foot above the ground around.

No other ruin of the same nature exists in the country. And there can have only been one minaret, for if another had stood close by it, and had fallen down, the tumulus raised by its débris would have been a conspicuous landmark for miles around. Small ruins of walls and buildings exist