Presupposition theory as as stated by Heim or Van der Sandt can be described by a number of abstract statements:

- presupposition resolution has precedence over presupposition accommodation
- global accommodations are preferred
- accommodation is limited by consistency and local accommodation
- triggers cannot be interpreted without having access to the presupposition they project

This is also the core of these theories, with good empirical motivation. A natural question is in virtue of what pragmatic principles these statements are true.

- new objects are avoided: *NEW
- relevance is maximised: RELEVANCE
- interpretations must be consistent: CONSISTENT (PLAUSIBLE)
- lexical and grammatical constraints must be respected: FAITH

But the principles are not of equal importance: FAITH > CONSISTENT > *NEW > RELEVANCE. This can be interpreted as an OT pragmatics e.g. one that selects the best new DRS K on the basis of a given DRS $K_0$ and the utterance $U$.

The claim is that the proper formulation of these principles suffices for the whole of pragmatics and covers more than most other proposals for general pragmatics that just deal with implicatures: also presupposition of course but also rhetorical structure. The real argument for proceeding in this way is that one obtains improvements in the treatment of the various areas. The talk will end with an attempt to show this for presupposition. Treating accommodation as a RELEVANCE implicature removes several problems in the existing treatments. Partial resolution comes into reach by *NEW. Lexical marking of locality is able to deal with various patterns of accommodation or not (demonstratives, politeness markers, pronouns, discourse particles), and binding from conditions in conditionals or not (only demonstratives and politeness markers).