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I. Introduction

In the linguistic theory of Lexical Phonology, Mohanan (1982) and Kiparsky (1982) suggest the lexical model in order to explain rule application patterns following the lexical strata and post-lexical strata displayed within a lexicon. Lexical boundaries of linguistic items are responsible for realizing the case of phonological, morphological, and semantical characteristics, whereas syntactical rules are realized after the lexical boundary. Before Lexical Phonology, Siegel (1974) divides English affixes into two classes: class I affixes and class II affixes. Siegel (1974: 102) insists that class I affixes cling to stems or words tightly with syllable boundary (#), and class II affixes attach only to words with word boundary (+). Class I affix undergoes phonological
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changes when affixes are attached to stems or words. For example, the negative prefix ‘in-’ changes its form to ‘im-’ when stems or words start with [p] sound like ‘impossible’. However, class II affixes do not change their form or sound when being attached to words like ‘unhappy’. Mohanan (1982) and Kiparsky (1982) think that this kind of hierarchy is also applied to lexical boundaries, and state that the lower rule must be applied before the higher-level rule. According to Level Ordering Hypothesis suggested by Mohanan (1982), class I affixes cannot transgress class II affix boundary. <Table 1> shows Siegel’s (1974: 111–148) classification of English affixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Siegel’s (1974) Classification of English Affix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefix</td>
<td>Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I affix</td>
<td>in-, ex-, con-, de-, re-, inter-, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II affix</td>
<td>un-, dis-, mis-, ab-, mono-, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This kind of classification could also be applied to Korean affixes. This paper explores the differences in the hierarchy of Korean negation affixes. It is assumed that Korean short-form negations are able to act as prefixes due to their limitations. After that, this paper also suggests English-Korean translation strategy following Lexically Layered Model of Lexical Phonology.

II. Lexical Phonology with Korean Negation

1. Restriction of Korean Short-form Negation

Much of the previous research into Korean negation regards Korean short-form negations as adverbs because Korean short-form negation is positioned before the verb (Nam and Go, 1993: 361; Seo, 2006: 937). However, No (1988), Park (1996), Park (2014), Won (2017), and others