Linguistic Interference : The Structure of Replying to Negative Questions in Persian and Japanese

Linguistic Interference: The Structure of Replying to Negative Questions in Persian and Japanese

Zahra Taheri

Tokyo University of Foreign Studies

Teaching the Persian language to Japanese students started almost half a century ago in Japan. The Persian departments in Osaka and Tokyo Universities of Foreign Studies have been the most active centers for both instruction and research in this field. Since the establishment of the Persian studies departments in these major universities, Japanese Iranologists have translated the masterpieces of Persian literature into Japanese and some of the most outstanding literary sources, as well as prominent figures in Persian classical literature, have been introduced to Japanese. Today, hundreds of Japanese students are majoring in Persian, and the Persian studies departments of Japanese universities are the largest, in terms of their size, and most important centers in this field outside Iran. In recent years, as a result of the political situation in the Middle East, Persian has drawn more global attention, and many more institutions in Japan have started to offer Persian language courses to their students.

Although the history of teaching Persian in Japan is relatively long, there have not been, to my knowledge, any studies done in linguistic fields to investigate the problems involved with teaching Persian to Japanese students. In this article, which I hope to be a small step for opening the door to further research in this area, the case of 'replying to negative questions' is discussed. Although for Japanese students who study Persian, linguistic interference applies to other areas of grammar as well as pronunciation and the system of verb conjugation, the most notably challenging subject for them is definitely replying to a negative question in Persian.

The majority of, if not all, Japanese students who study Persian at the university level are majoring in this language, and Persian should function as the foundation of their education in their undergraduate and graduate studies; they are therefore expected to attain a certain level of proficiency by

their junior year in order to be able to take literature courses. I should point out here that, since these students have studied English, and in rare cases, French, as their second language (L2), Persian should be considered as their third language (L3).

Borrowing, Transfer, Interference

In the process of learning a foreign language, the learner usually looks from the window of his/her native language structure at the rules and regulations of the new language and applies the familiar patterns of his native language to the target language. As Larry Selinker points out, "The problem of transfer of the structural patterns of one's native language to a foreign language is well known to linguists as a general phenomenon."[1] Linguists consider this phenomenon as a natural process in learning a foreign language, and have compared it with the situation of a visitor to another society who usually brings his/her own cultural categories and interprets everything in those terms. Therefore, in learning a foreign language it wouldn't be unexpected if learners transfer "the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture."[2] Robert Lado, one of the first linguists who examined this phenomenon, explains it thus:

> The grammatical structure of the native language tends to be transferred to the foreign language. The student tends to transfer the sentence forms, modification devices, the number, gender, and case patterns of his active language [to the foreign language]. . . . This transfer occurs very subtly so that the learner is not even aware of it unless it is called to his attention in specific instances. And we know that even then he will underestimate the strength of these transferred habits, which we suspect may be as difficult to change when transferred as when they operate in the native

---

1   Larry Selinker, "Language Transfer," in Susan Gass and Larry Selinker, eds., *Language Transfer in Language Learning* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1983), p. 33.
2   Robert Lado, "Excerpts from *Linguistics across Culture*," in Gass and Selinker (1983), p. 23.

language.[3]

Other definitions of language transfer bear, more or less, the same implication in different terms. Susan Gass also describes this phenomenon thus: "[W]hen attempting to communicate in a second language, second language learners often transfer elements of their native language onto the speech patterns of the target language."[4] Differences between the structure and grammatical system of one's native language and those of his/her target language have an undeniable effect on the production of the target language, and could create a learning barrier. Hence the instructors should attempt to predict and describe these differences in the process of their teaching. Different terms, such as 'borrowing', 'transfer', and 'interference' have been used for this phenomenon; in this article, I have chosen the term 'interference,' since this phenomenon causes a long-term difficulty in the learning process, and its effect on the learner's production of the target language—in this case Persian—is so strong and complicated that terms such as 'borrowing' or even 'transfer' sound too weak to define it.

The Structure of Replying to Negative Questions in Japanese

The structure of replying to negative questions in Japanese and Persian is different. The negative answer in Japanese starts with "*hai*" [yes] followed by a negative verb, and the affirmative answer starts with "*iie*" [no] followed by a positive verb. In this structure, the short answers of 'Yes' and 'No' wouldn't be sufficient, by any means, for explanation of the final result.

> Q: *Kinou gakkou ni ikanakatta?* [didn't you go to school yesterday?]
> A*a* [*a* = affirmative]: *iie, itta.* [no, I did go]
> A*n* [*n* = negative]: *hai, ikanakatta.* [yes, I didn't go]

The grammatical structure of replying to negative questions in Japanese is probably one of the structural characteristics of the many languages from the Altaic language family.[5] Although many linguists doubt that Japanese

---

3 Lado, p. 25.

4 Susan Gass, "Language Transfer and Universal Grammatical Relations," in Gass and Selinker (1983), p. 69.

5 The relationships among these languages remain a matter of debate among histori-

should be included in this language family, Japanese shares this structure with Mongolian, Turkish, Korean, and the Oyghouri branches of the Altaic language family.

The Pattern of Replying to Negative Questions in Persian

The structure of replying to negative questions in the Persian language is not only different from Japanese, but is also completely the opposite. In Persian, when the answer to a negative question is 'yes,' it must be followed by a sentence which confirms the positivity of the answer (positive verb), and when the answer is 'no,' it must be followed by a sentence which confirms the negativity of the answer (negative verb).

> Q: -*diruz be madreseh narafti?* [didn't you go to school yesterday?]
> A*n*: -*na, naraftam.* [no, I didn't go.]
> A*a*: -*chrera, raftam.* [yes, I did go]

In Persian, the short answer of 'yes' or 'no' to negative questions explains the speaker's response clearly, and it is sufficient to use either of these terms as a complete response, therefore in both cases—negative answer [A*n*] and affirmative answer [A*a*]—just using *na* or *chera* would be sufficient to answer the question because *na* [no] indicates the negativity of its following verb and *chera* [yes] signifies the positivity of its following verb. The structure of short answer in our example question, then, could be shortened to just 'yes' or 'no':

> Q:-*diruz be madreseh narafti?* [didn't you go to school yesterday?]
> A*n*:- *na* [no, I didn't go]
> A*a*:-*chera* [yes, I did]

This pattern is a common structure of many of Indo-European languages, and Persian, which belongs to one of the main branches of the Indo-

---

cal linguists. Some scholars consider the obvious similarity among these languages to indicate a genetic relationship; others propose that it is the result of a sprachbund. The proponents of Altaic traditionally considered it to include the Turkic languages, the Mongolic languages, the Tungusic languages (or Manchu-Tungus), and sometimes Japanese or Korean. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Altaic_languages

European languages, the Indo-Iranian language family, shares the pattern of replying to negative questions with English, German, Hindi, and other languages which also belong to the same language family.[6]

It should be mentioned here that the usual term for a positive answer in Persian *bale* [yes] is not used for replying to negative questions, instead its synonym *chera* [yes, of course] is used.

Positive question:

> Q: -*diruz be madreseh rafti?* [did you go to schol yesterday?]
> A*a* : -*bale, raftam.* [yes, I did.]

Negative question:

> Q: -*diruz be madrese narafti?* [didn't you go to school yesterday?
> A*a*: -*chera, raftem.* [yes, I did go]

Persian shares this pattern with German. In German also the term used to make a positive answer to positive questions is '*ja*' and the trem used to make a positive answer to negative questions is '*doch*,' as shown in the following example:

Positive question:

> Q: -*magst du Fisch?* [do you like fish?]
> A*a*: -*ja, ich mag Fisch.* [yes, I like fish.]

Negative question:

> Q: -*magst du keinen Fisch?* [don't you like fish?]
> A*a*: -*doch, ich liebe Fisch.* [yes, I love fish.]

---

6 Persian is an Indo-European language spoken in Iran, Afghanistan and Tajikistan and by minorities in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Southern Russia, neighboring countries, and elsewhere. It is derived from the language of the ancient Persian people. Persian and its varieties have official-language status in Iran, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan and there are approximately 62 million native speakers of Persian in Iran, Afghanistan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan, and about the same number of people in other parts of the world speak Persian. Persian has been a medium for literary and scientific contributions to the Islamic world as well as the Western. It has had an influence on certain neighboring languages, particularly the Turkic languages of Central Asia, the Caucasus, and Anatolia.

This term change also causes confusion in the process of replying to negative questions in Persian for Japanese learners.

Observing the Profundity of Linguistic Interference

This has been the subject of a long case study during my four years of teaching Persian to Japanese students at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies. Through the process of teaching, I recognized that my students have difficulty making a correct answer to negative questions while communicating in Persian, and their responses to such questions do not fit into the frame of Persian grammar. Japanese students tend to apply the pattern of their native language to Persian, and, to a certain extent, their language skills (writing and conversation) are affected by this interference. The result of using the structure of the Japanese pattern of replying to negative questions and translating it into Persian sounds very confusing and even strange in Persian, and it wouldn't be possible for a Persian native speaker to figure out whether the answer was positive or negative. On the other hand the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian creates serious confusion for Japanese students as well, since it is completely contrary to the structure of their mother tongue.

Since the grammatical knowledge of the learner's native language is one of the major factors that have a great influence on the form and properties of the target language grammar,[7] I noticed that when students are first introduced to the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian, they naturally are more comfortable with literally translating the familiar Japanese structure into Persian and using it in their writing and speaking. The first evaluation at this stage shows that the new structure of replying to negative questions in Persian is not acceptable to students because it goes against the logic of their native language structure. The first test on replying to negative questions, after being introduced to the Persian pattern, shows students' rejection of using the new structure they must have adopted to correctly answer negative questions in Persian. From twenty students tested in

---

7 Christian Adjemian and Juana Liceras, "Accounting for Adult Acquisition of Relative Clauses: Universal Grammar, L1, and Structuring the Intake," in Fred Eckman, Lawrence Bell, and Diane Nelson, eds., *Universals of Second Language Acquisition* (Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1984) p. 101.

this stage two students used the correct Persian structure and the rest of them used the Japanese pattern. [Sample shown in Table 1]

We can predict and describe those grammatical structures of the foreign language that cause difficulty in the learning process by a systematic comparison between the two languages. Therefore, in this stage, materials prepared on the basis of such a comparison can be helpful. As linguists argue, learners of a new language may use the pattern of their mother tongue while communicating in the foreign language because they have not recognized that the structures and internal rules of the second language are different. Therefore, explaining this "difference" can clarify the structure of the target language in comparison with the learner's native language. At this stage, comparison between the two different structures of replying to negative questions in Persian and Japanese would help students to recognize the new pattern through understanding the "differences." As Charles Fries has observed, "The most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner."[8] The materials prepared for Japanese students at this stage were designed to reduce difficulties and facilitate the process of learning by helping them to recognize the differences. [Sample shown in Table 2.] In these examples the structure of replying to negative questions in Japanese has been used to explain the structure of the Persian pattern; in other words, I have tried to draw students' attention to the fact that they should use the short answer (*chera* [yes] or *na* [no]) contrary to their native language structure in order to reply correctly to negative questions in Persian:

Persian:

To negate: Negative short answer (no) + negative Verb

To affirm: Positive short answer (yes) + positive verb

Japanese

To affirm: Negative short answer (no) + positive verb

To negate: Positive short answer (yes) + negative verb

---

8 Charles Fries, *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945), p. 9.

As a result of focusing on practices designed to help the students to apply this pattern in their communication, improvement in appropriate usage, indicating that students had recognized the difference between the two different structures of replying to negative questions in Japanese and Persian, was observable in their writing and classroom conversation. Retesting students at this stage shows a positive result on learning [sample shown in Table 3] but does not indicate that through the two stages of 1) teaching the grammatical rules and regulations by definitions and 2) clarifying their differences by comparison, the interference has been eliminated. The difference between the grammatical and logical structure of the two languages in this case is more profound than a simple transfer and the interference continues to emerge persistently in the learner's future conversations.

Premeditated and Impulsive Communications

The use of a grammatical structure by a speaker is based on habit; therefore, as Lado argues, from early childhood, the native speaker of a language practically reduces all the operation of his grammatical system to habit and while speaking, his attention is mostly on the stream of thought and "on the reaction of his listener, and only very slightly on some features of his grammatical constructions." He then points out the strength and depth of this habit and writes: "We simply do not realize the strength and the complexity of the habit system we have acquired through all the years of daily use of our native language."[9]

Teaching the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian, comparing the basis of the differences between its structure and that in the Japanese language, and supporting the learning process by intensive practices, gradually improve students' ability in using the proper pattern in their writing as well as in classroom conversations, especially in premeditated situations, but the issue remains more or less unsolved when it comes to spontaneous conversation in the classroom or spontaneous conversation with Persian native speakers. I should point out here the important fact that the opportunity for Japanese learners to use Persian outside the classroom is little and our struggle to establish a club or reading group for Persian-speaking students has been largely fruitless.

---

9 Lado, pp. 24-25.

In the process of learning the grammatical patterns of a foreign language, the learner loses the comfort of habit in communication especially if the new pattern conflicts with his/her native language. In the process of learning the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian, Japanese students should focus on the new different pattern, completely opposite to the logic of their native language structure, and suppress their old habit in order to make a proper response in Persian. In our class conversations students are eager to discover the rationale behind this difference and ask for a definition. I suggest that the logic behind the structure of replying to negative questions in Japanese could be explained as follows.

In replying to our example question with '*iie, itta.*' [no, I did go], *iie* has the connotation of 'you are not right (if you thought that I didn't go), I went to school yesterday,' therefore the whole idea brought up in the negative sentence is referred to and answered. This describes as well the usage of the positive short answer followed by a negative verb: *hai, ikanakatta.* [yes, I didn't go]. *hai* here also indicates that 'you are right (if you thought that I didn't go). I didn't go to school yesterday.'

The logic behind the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian, in contrast, focuses on the action of the verb under consideration, and in the response, the speaker should make clear whether the act of 'going' happened or not. The negative response of '*na, naraftam*' [no, I didn't go] explains that the verb (act of going) did not happen and the positive response of '*chera, raftam*' [yes, I did] explains that the act did happen.

As mentioned earlier, Persian shares the grammatical structure of replying to negative questions with English, therefore Japanese students have already been introduced to this pattern in high school during the process of learning English as their second language, so we might expect them to recognize it as a familiar pattern previously learned, and use it without confusion. However, the system of teaching English in Japanese high schools, being test-oriented, causes them to be confused by this pattern as they have never been introduced to such a structure. In any case the language learner cannot put this pattern to immediate use in a conversational situation. In this case, one can assume consequently that the pattern had probably been learned, but not yet acquired.

Almost certainly, learners of Japanese whose native language is Persian, English, or other languages which have the same pattern for replying

to negative questions, might have the same problem with these contrasting structures. For instance, one of the textbooks written to teach Japanese to English-speaking students, *Japanese for Busy People,* emphasizes the secondary meaning of the terms *'hai'* and *'iie'* in order to make understanding the grammatical structure easier for learners, and the reason for this explanation, as the authors suggest, is to prevent English-speaking students from transferring the English pattern of replying to negative questions to Japanese. In the first chapter we read:

> *hai* is virtually the same as 'yes.' *iie* is virtually the same as 'no.' It is better, however, to think of *hai* as meaning 'that's right,' and *iie* as meaning 'that's wrong'. Otherwise nega-tive questions can be a problem.[10]

Native speakers of Persian as well are likely to have the same confusion while learning the pattern of replying to negative questions in Japanese. Surprisingly, I have noticed that there is a conversational pattern in spoken Persian which could help explain this case to Persian-speaking learners of Japanese. In colloquial Persian, when the tone of a negative question is offensive, unpleasant, prying, or surprising, there is an idiomatic pattern used just for affirmative reply which resembles the Japanese pattern and starts with *na baba* [literally meaning 'no, papa!']. In everyday spoken Persian it would be accepted if someone replied as follows to our example question:

> Q: -*diruz be madreseh narafti*? [didn't you go to school yesterday?]
> Aa^1: -*na baba, raftam.* [no, that's not right, I did go to school]
> Or:
> Aa^2: -*chera, raftam.* [yes, I did go]

'na baba' is common slang usually used for denial or astonishment, therefore the first affirmative answer [Aa^1] in our example has the connotation of 'I deny the information you have about me not going to school yesterday, of course I went to school.' Using this pattern as an example might help instructors of Persian to explain the grammatical structure of replying

---

10 Association for Japanese Language Teaching (AJALT), *Japanese for Busy People* (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1994), p. 20.

to negative questions in Japanese to the learners. At any rate, whether or not the process of learning the new pattern of replying to negative questions and using it in conversation is as difficult for English-speaking or Persian-speaking students who study Japanese, should be taken into consideration by Japanese language instructors.

Conclusion

The difference between the grammatical structures of replying to negative questions in Persian and Japanese is a source of linguistic interference for Japanese native speakers who learn Persian. As it would not be easy for a visitor to a different culture to suspend his own cultural perspective and learn the categories of reality in the new society, a new language learner might face a long challenge to develop his/her skill in correct communication in the target language structure and patterns. Adopting and applying the structure of replying to negative questions in Persian is one of these cases, both confusing and challenging for Japanese students.

The process of learning the structure of replying to negative questions for Japanese students could be divided to four stages:

1. The learner learns the grammatical rule.
2. He knows the rule, but has not yet acquired it.
3. Comparison between the grammatical structures of replying to negative questions in Persian and Japanese gives the learner a better understanding of the pattern difference, and clarifies the reason for the error.
4. The learner starts to use it correctly in writing and class conversations, but still has difficulty using it outside the class and in everyday conversation.

In the sophomore, junior, and senior years, Japanese students have no problem using the correct pattern of replying to negative questions in the classroom when either the subject of conversation is known, or there is enough time to make the response, but in free speaking or regular conversation with native speakers they usually continue to use the familiar pattern of their native language automatically. This long-lasting interference problem demonstrates that using a grammatical pattern opposite to the structure

of one's native language is a very complex operation. The phenomenon of grammatical interference is viewed by linguists as "the result of a failure to acquire a rule or to proceed to the 'proper' transitional form which is considered to be the result of substituting previous and often inappropriate knowledge for gaps in the subconscious knowledge of the second language."[11] Only advanced Japanese speakers of Persian who have lived among native speakers, traveled to Iran, or have lived or studied there, or those who have constant contact with the Persian community in Japan, can overcome the force of their native language pattern and avoid this linguistic interference.

Table 1

1. 現在形

「あなたは図書館に行かないのですか？」

[don't you go to the library?] *shoma be ketabkhaneh nemiravid?*

(肯定)

× 「はい、行きます」	○ [yes, I go] *chera, miravam.*
○ 「<u>いいえ</u>、行きます」	× [No, I go] *na, miravam.*

(否定)

× 「いいえ、行きません」	○ [no, I don't go] *na, nemiravam.*
○ 「<u>はい</u>、行きません」	× [yes, I don't go] *chera, nemiravam.*

2. 過去形

「あなたは図書館に行かなかったのですか？」

[didn't you go to the library?] *shoma be ketabkhaneh naraftid?*

(肯定)

× 「はい、行きました」	○ [yes, I did] *chera, raftam.*
○ 「<u>いいえ</u>、行きました」	× [no, I did] *na, raftam.*

(否定)

× 「いいえ、行きませんでした」	○ [no, I didn't go] *na, naraftam.*
○ 「<u>はい</u>、行きませんでした」	× [yes, I didn't go] *chera, naraftam.*

11 Krashen, Stephen, "Newmaks 'Ignorance Hypothesis' and Current Second Language Acquisition Theory," in Gass and Selinker (1983), p. 141.

3. 現在完了形

「あなたはまだ図書館に行ったことがないのですか？」

[haven't you gone to the library yet?] *hanuz be ketabkhaneh naraftehee?*

（肯定）

× 「はい、行ったことはあります」　　　　○ [yes, I have] *chera, rafteham.*

○ 「<u>いいえ</u>、行ったことはあります」　　　× [no, I have] *na, rafteham.*

（否定）

× 「いいえ、行ったことはありません」○ [no, I haven't gone] *na, narafteham*

○ 「<u>はい</u>、行ったことはありません」　× [yes, I haven't] *chera, narafteham.*

4. 過去完了形

「あなたは(それまで)図書館に行ったことがなかったのですか？」

[hadn't you gone to the library before?] *ghablan be ketabkhaneh narafteh budi?*

（肯定）

× 「はい、行ったことはありました」　　○ [yes, I had gone] *chera, rafteh budam.*

○ 「<u>いいえ</u>、行ったことはありました」× [no, I had gone] *na, rafteh budam*

（否定）

× 「いいえ、行ったことはありませんでした」○ [no, I hadn't gone] *na, narafteh budam.*

○ 「<u>はい</u>、行ったことはありませんでした」　　× [yes, I hadn't gone] *chera, narafteh budam.*

5. 未来形

「あなたはイランに行かないつもりですか？」

[won't you go to Iran?] *be Iran nakhahi raft?*

（肯定）

× 「はい、行くつもりです」　　　　　○ [yes, I will go] *chear, khaham raft.*

○ 「いいえ、行くつもりです」　　　　× [no, I will go] *na, khaham raft.*

（否定）

× 「いいえ、行かないつもりです」　○ [no, I won't go]　*na, nakhaham raft.*

○ 「はい、行かないつもりです」　　× [yes, I won't go]　*chera, nakhaham raft.*

Table 2

1.

shoma hafteye pish be kyoto naraftid?

[didn't you go to Kyoto last week?]

あなたは先週京都へ行かなかったのですか？

bale（肯定）, *man hafteye pish be Kyoto naraftam*（否定）

[<u>yes</u>, I <u>didn't</u> go to Kyoto last week.]

はい。私は先週京都へ行きませんでした。

2.

khahare shoma Farsi harf nemizanad?

[doesn't your sister speak Persian?]

あなたの姉／妹はペルシア語を話さないのですか？

bale（肯定）, *khaharam Farsi harf nemizanad*（否定）.

[<u>yes</u>, my sister <u>doesn't</u> speak Persian.]

はい。私の姉／妹はペルシア語を話しません。

3.

shoma iin film ra nadideh budid?

[hadn't you seen this movie?]

あなたはこの映画を見なかったのですか？

bale（肯定）, *man iin film ra nadideh budam*（否定）.

[<u>yes</u>, I <u>hadn't</u> seen this movie.]

はい。私はこの映画を見ませんでした。

4.

shoma hanuz be Iran narafteiid?

[haven't you traveled to Iran yet?]

あなたはまだイランに行ったことがないのですか？

bale（肯定）, *man be Iran narafteam*（否定）.

[<u>yes</u>, I <u>haven't</u> gone to Iran.]

はい。私はイランに行ったことがありません。

5.

to sale aayandeh be chin nemiravi?

[won't you go to china next year?]

君は来年中国へ行かないのですか？

bale（肯定）*, man sale aayandeh be chin nemiravam*（否定）.

[<u>yes</u>, I <u>won't</u> go to China next year.]

はい。私は来年中国へ行きません。

6.

madare shoma nato dust nadarad?

[doesn't your mother like *natto*?]

あなたのお母さんは納豆が好きではないのですか？

na（否定）*, madaram nato dust darad*（肯定）.

[<u>no</u>, my mother <u>likes</u> *natto*.]

いいえ。私の母は納豆が好きです。

7.

to havaye sard ra dost nadari?

[don't you like the cold weather?]

君は寒さが好きではないのですか？

na（否定）*, man havaye sard ra dost daram*（肯定）.

[<u>no</u>, I <u>like</u> the cold weather.]

いいえ。私は寒い気候が好きです。

8.

be dostetan nameh neminevisid?

[don't you write a letter to your friend?]

あなたの友人に手紙を書かないのですか？

bale（肯定）*, man be dostam nameh neminevisam*（否定）.

[<u>yes</u>, I <u>don't</u> write a letter to my friend.]

いいえ。私は友人に手紙を書きます。

9.

uu ketab ra be to nadad?

[didn't he give you the book?]

彼は本を君に渡さなかったのですか？

bale (肯定*), uu ketab ra nadad*（否定）.

[yes, he didn't.]

はい。彼は渡しませんでした。

Table 3

1.

be aqaye Shahriari nameh neminevisid?

[don't you write a letter to Mr. shariyari?]

あなたはシャハリヤーリー氏に手紙を書かないのですか？

na (否定), *man be uu nameh neminevisam*（否定）.

はい。私は彼に手紙を書きません。

[no, I don't write him a letter.]

2.

ketab ra az ketabkhaneh nagereftid?

[didn't you borrow the book from the library?]

（君は）本を図書館から借りてこなかったのですか？

na（否定）*, ketab ra az ketabkhaneh nagereftam*（否定）.

[no, I didn't take the book from the library.]

はい。（私は）本を図書館から借りてきませんでした。

3.

hanuz filme "hari potar" ra nadideii?

[haven't you seen the Harry Potter movie yet?]

（君は）まだ「ハリー・ポッター」の映画を見ていないのですか？

chera (「なぜ」), *filme "hari patar" ra dideham*（肯定）.
[yes, I have seen the Harry Potter movie.]
いいえ。（私は）「ハリー・ポッター」の映画を見ました。

4.

sale aayandeh be Italia nemiravi?
[don't you go to Italy next year?]
（君は）来年イタリアへ行かないのですか？

na（否定）, *sale aayandeh be Italia nemiravam*（否定）.
[no, I don't go to Italy next year.]
はい。私は来年イタリアへ行きません。

5.

qablan ghazaaye Irani nakhordeh budid?
[hadn't you eaten Persian food before?]
（君は）以前イラン料理を食べたことがないのですか？

chera（「なぜ」, *ghazaye Irani khordeh budam*（肯定）.
[yes, I had eaten Persian food before.]
いいえ。イラン料理を食べたことがあります。

6.

pedare shoma piano nemizanad?
[doesn't your father play piano?]
あなたの父親はピアノを弾かないのですか？

na（否定）, *pedaram piano nemizanad*（否定）.
[no, he doesn't play piano.]
はい。私の父はピアノを弾きません。

7.

aanha hanuz be Iran safar nakardehand?
[haven't they traveled to Iran yet?]
彼らはまだイランへ旅行したことがないのですか？

chera（「なぜ」）*, aanha be Iran safar kardehand*（肯定）*.*
[yes, they have traveled to Iran.]
いいえ。彼らはイランへ旅行をしたことがあります。

8.

be conference "zabane farsi" dar Kyoto nemiravi?
[don't you go to "Persian language" conference in Kyoto?]
（君は）京都での「ペルシア語」の学会に行かないのですか？

na（否定）*, be conference "zabane farsi" dar Kyoto nemiravam*（否定）*.*
[no, I don't go to the "Persian language" conference in Kyoto.]
はい。（私は）京都での「ペルシア語」の学会へは行きません。

9.

iin ketab ra nakhandehii?
[haven't you read this book?]
この本を読んでいないのですか？

chera（「なぜ」）*, iin ketab ra khandeham*（肯定）*.*
[yes, I have read this book.]
いいえ。この本を読みました。

10.

emruz be festivale filme Irani narafti?
[didn't you go to Persian film festival today?]
（君は）今日イラン映画祭へ行かなかったのですか？

na（否定）*, emruz be festivale filme Irani naraftam*（否定）*.*
[no, I didn't go to the Persian film festival.]
はい。（私は）今日イラン映画祭へ行きません。