

# A Pox on *Prior To*



## References

Theodore M. Bernstein, *The Careful Writer* 346 (1972): *Prior to* is a “faddish affectation for *before*. Would you say *posterior to* in place of *after*?”

Roy H. Copperud, *American Usage and Style: The Consensus* 305 (1980): *Prior to* is “pompous in the sense *before*.”

Bryan A. Garner, *A Dictionary of Modern Legal Usage* 692 (2d ed. 1995): “*Prior to* is a terribly overworked lawyerism. Only in rare contexts is it not much inferior to *before*.”

Sir Ernest Gowers, *The Complete Plain Words* 110 (Sydney Greenbaum & Janet Whitcut eds., rev. ed. 1986): “There is no good reason to use *prior to* as a preposition instead of *before*. *Before* is simpler, better known and more natural, and therefore preferable.”

Joseph Kimble, *A Modest Wish List for Legal Writing*, 79 Mich. B.J. 1574, 1577 (2000): “*Prior to* takes the booby prize for the most common inflated phrase in legal and official writing. Why would

anyone prefer it to *before*? Try to think of a single literary title or line that uses *prior to*. . . . By itself, *prior to* may seem insignificant. But it often leads to clumsy, indirect constructions. . . . More important, a fondness for *prior to* may indicate a fondness for jargon—and a blind resistance to using plain words. That resistance, that cast of mind, is in large part responsible for the state of legal writing.” ◆

---

“Plain Language” is a regular feature of the *Michigan Bar Journal*, edited by Joseph Kimble for the Plain English Subcommittee of the Publications and Website Advisory Committee. We seek to improve the clarity of legal writing and the public opinion of lawyers by eliminating legalese. Want to contribute a plain-English article? Contact Prof. Kimble at Thomas Cooley Law School, P.O. Box 13038, Lansing, MI 48901, or at kimblej@cooley.edu. For more information about plain English, see our website—[www.michbar.org/committees/pengcom.html](http://www.michbar.org/committees/pengcom.html).

---