Introduction

- Jesney (2011a): Positional Licensing (PL; e.g., Walker 2011) is more powerful in Harmonic Grammar (HG) than in OT.
- Only in HG can PL produce licensing in multiple contexts.
- Tamil (Ramassamy 2010; Christdas 1988): coronals appear in onsets and initial-syllable codas (1). Elsewhere they assimilate (2).

1. maa ‘sore’
2. /pʊːɡ + kʊːɡ/ ‘children’
3. ma.R3 ‘teacher’
4. /kʊːɡ + tʊːɡ/ ‘koppu (emph.)’
5. maa ‘friend’
6. /maa.x3.p a month

Jesney shows that a PL analysis of these facts is possible only in HG.

- This would be welcome:
  - PF and PL overlap (Kaplan 2013).
  - PF makes incorrect predictions (Jesney 2011b).

Our argument: PF is still necessary in HG.

- The analysis for coronals in Tamil is incompatible with non-coronals.
- PL triggers assimilation, but does not dictate directionality.

⇒ PF is the correct solution for both problems.

Licensing for Coronals

- Jesney: a PL analysis of licensing in multiple contexts is only possible in HG.
- OT: both LICENSE(place, Onset) and LICENSE(coronal, σ1) must outrank FAITH, otherwise they have no effect.

But this results in coronals surfacing only in the onset of σ1; because only there do they satisfy both licensing constraints.

OT requires a PF account (Beckman 1999).

- Licensing in two contexts: a segment is permitted when it does not violate both licensing constraints.
- I.e., violating one licensing constraint is better than violating FAITH; violating both is worse.

This is possible in HG:
- w(FAITH) > w(LICENSE(place, Onset)), w(LICENSE(coronal, σ1)): faithfulness wins when one licensing constraint is violated.
- w(LICENSE(place, Onset)) + w(LICENSE(coronal, σ1)): violating both licensing constraints triggers unfaithfulness.

Under these conditions, coronals are preserved in onsets and σ1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/maa.x3.p</th>
<th>IDENT(Place)</th>
<th>LIC(Place, Onset)</th>
<th>LIC(coronal, σ1)</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ma.R3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ma.R3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. ma.R3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. ma.R3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...and they assimilate elsewhere:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/kʊːɡ + tʊːɡ/</th>
<th>IDENT(Place)</th>
<th>LIC(Place, Onset)</th>
<th>LIC(coronal, σ1)</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ɡ3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ɡ3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In HG, PL does some of the work of PF. Maybe PF is superfluous.

Licensing for Non-Coronals

Non-coronals assimilate in all codas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/maa + ɡ/</th>
<th>IDENT(Place)</th>
<th>LIC(place, Onset)</th>
<th>LIC(coronal, σ2)</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. ma.R3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. ma.R3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Under the analysis in (5), only coronals assimilate because only they are subject to both licensing constraints (only violations for /m/ are shown):