In Haitian Creole (HC), future reference can be expressed by the morphemes pral and ap (a third future form, (a)va), will not be discussed here). The meaning of the morpheme pral has not been well-characterized in existing research on HC; ap is generally described as a morpheme which expresses a "CERTAIN" future (Valdman, 1978; Damoiseau, 2005). Certainty does not distinguish ap from pral, however. Intuitively, pral is used when the causal processes leading to the future eventuality could not in principle be interrupted, while ap is used when such processes could be interrupted. For example, when a cup is on the edge of a table, threatening to fall, pral is acceptable, as in (1a), while ap is not so acceptable, as shown in (1b). However, with a ball rolling toward a cup which is secure in the middle of the table, pral as in (1a) is unacceptable while ap as in (1b) is acceptable.

(1) a. Tas la pral tonbe. ✓ #
   ‘The cup PRAL fall.’
   cup DET PRAL fall

b. Tas la ap tonbe. #?
   ‘The cup AP fall.’

   cup DET AP fall

Likewise, if John wishes to buy a car and everything is already planned and he already has the money, both pral as in (2a) and ap in (2b) are acceptable; however, in the case where John has no money yet, pral as in (2a) is unacceptable while ap as in (2b) is acceptable.

(2) a. Jan pral achte yon machin demen. ✓ #
   ‘Jean PRAL buy a car tomorrow.’
   John PRAL buy a car tomorrow

b. Jan ap achte yon machin demen. ✓ ✓
   ‘John AP buy a car tomorrow’

   John AP buy a car tomorrow

Note that ap and pral are not the same as familiar English forms that behave similarly on the tests in (1) and (2); e.g., ap is not like English may, and pral is not like the English progressive.

(3) #Tas la ap tonbe men tas la p ap tonbe.
   ‘The cup AP fall but the cup not AP fall.’

   cup DET AP fall but cup DET NEG AP fall

(4) Jan pral gen eleksyon an demen. pral doesn't require plannability
   ‘John PRAL win the election tomorrow.’ (cf. English #John wins the election tomorrow.)

   Jan PRAL win election DETtomorrow

Building on the work of Copley (2005, 2018), we propose ((5a, b, d) below) that pral, like futurates in English (e.g. John is buying a car tomorrow, (5c)) expresses ceteris paribus direct causation between an ongoing situation and the situation that the prejacent is predicated of. The causation has to be direct because (1a) is unacceptable when the ball has to roll to get to the vase,
and because (2a) is unacceptable when Jan has still to get the money. That is, the ongoing situation including only the subject and its properties does not itself cause a situation of which the prejacent is true, under a \textit{ceteris paribus} assumption (closed-world plus normality). Unlike futurates in English, however, \textit{pral} does not require plannability ((4) above). Following Copley (2018), English futurates require plannability because (i) they require an extra causal relation introducing \( s \) so as to avoid the case where the agent’s action occurs both now and tomorrow; (ii) direct causation enforces spatiotemporal contiguity between \( s \) and \( s' \) (Fodor 1970); (iii) spatiotemporal contiguity requires \( s \) to doubly access now and tomorrow; (iv) only statives do double access (Enç 1987); (v) hence \( s \) must be an intentional state which causes the agent’s action, i.e., a plan.

We propose that HC verbs that allow \textit{pral} even though unplannable (as in (4)) have an extra causal relation (Kratzer 2005, Alexiadou 2006). This makes (4) acceptable even though winning the election is unplannable because: there is an extra causal relation between \( s \) and the situation of which the prejacent is true, namely \( s'' \), so there is no spatiotemporal contiguity required between \( s \) and \( s'' \) (cf. ii), so there is no double access required (cf. iii and iv) so \( s \) need not be a plan (cf. v). (This analysis implies that such verbs in English don’t have an extra causal relation.)

(5)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{\textit{pral}} = \text{sp} \cdot s': s \text{DIRECTLY-CAUSES} s' \& \text{p}(s') \\
\text{b. } & \text{\textit{(2a)}} = s \cdot s': s \text{DIRECTLY-CAUSES} s' \& \text{AGENT(Jan, s') \& buy(s') \& tomorrow(s') \& s' \text{DIRECTLY-CAUSES} s'' \& \text{Jan-has-a-car}(s'')}
\end{align*}
\]

c. English futurates (modified from Copley 2018): \[\text{\textit{John is buying a car tomorrow}} = \text{s. s’s DIRECTLY-CAUSES s’ \& AGENT(Jan, s’) \& buy(s’) \& tomorrow(s’) \& s’ DIRECTLY-CAUSES s'' \& John-has-a-car(s'’)}\]

d. \[\text{\textit{(4)}} = s \cdot s': s \text{DIRECTLY-CAUSES s’ \& s’': s’ DIRECTLY-CAUSES s'' \& THEME(Jan, s’’) \& \text{win-the-election}(s’’) \& \text{tomorrow}(s’’)}\]

In contrast to \textit{pral}, \textit{ap} has a ”ratificational“ meaning (Giannakidou & Mari 2016, 2017) like \textit{will}.

(6)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ariadne must/#will be sick.} \\
\text{b. I } & \text{Ariadne thain arrosti} \text{ Greek} \\
\text{c. } & \text{Li dwe/#ap malad.} \text{ HC}
\end{align*}
\]