

**From:** "Rooryck, J.E.C.V." <J.E.C.V.Rooryck@hum.leidenuniv.nl>  
**Date:** Tuesday, 8 August 2017 at 12:19  
**To:** Chris Pringle <c.pringle@elsevier.com>  
**Subject:** Re: Review invitation for LINGUA\_2017\_242

Dear Chris,

My decision to move to Open Access had nothing to do with being rotated out of my role, or wishing to retain 'power', as you state elsewhere. I do not know where you get that notion. It is a gratuitous speculation on your behalf, unsupported by statements or discussions that I had a part in. I also have no personal animus against you, but your present actions are defamatory.

Like I said, any other mention of me or my role as an editor or your judgment thereof will be met with legal action that will provide further negative publicity for Elsevier. I have made your statements to these reviewers public, by the way, and will meet your underhanded tactics with complete transparency. I will also make this correspondence public.

The statement that journals should be all about scholarship and only about scholarship is a rich one coming from Elsevier. It is also patently false: journals are also about the economics of academic publishing, or we wouldn't be here. If journals were all about scholarship, why could Elsevier not have met the five principles of Fair Open Access? What you actually mean is much more paternalistic: journals should be about scholarship for authors and editors, and the economic and financial aspects of exploiting the academic community should be left to the publishers. It is much like saying to coffee farmers that coffee farming should be all about the quality of their product, they should not worry about price, distribution, and profits.

But journals will indeed fall and stand by scholarship alone, and the pitiful quality of what is now being published in Lingua, and the fun that is being made about it on social media, does not bode well in that regard. By changing the aims and scope of the journal, you effectively made Lingua a new journal under an old flag, much like putting a Mercedes star on a wheelbarrow. I do not see why the linguistic community should support that effort. If journals are about scholarship and scholarship alone, most of the community have decided that Lingua is no longer where decent scholarship is to be found.

Sincerely,  
Johan

**From:** "Pringle, Chris (ELS-OXF)" <c.pringle@elsevier.com>  
**Date:** Tuesday, 8 August 2017 at 05:38  
**To:** "Rooryck, J.E.C.V." <J.E.C.V.Rooryck@hum.leidenuniv.nl>  
**Subject:** RE: Review invitation for LINGUA\_2017\_242

Dear Johan,

Thank you for your message. Yes, when prospective reviewers such as [redacted] have cited reasons for declining our invitations which I think may be based on distorted perceptions of the Lingua case, I have been writing to them to show that there are two sides to the story.

I should like to take this opportunity to say that I have no personal animus towards you. On the contrary: I remember you and I worked happily together years ago, and I very much regret that your relationship with Elsevier subsequently soured so much that it has brought us to this point. As I said in my message to Jacob, and also to others, I genuinely sympathise with your situation. You were appointed with the expectation of continuing as editor so long as you were doing a good job; then Elsevier introduced its rotation policy, and that expectation was unilaterally changed. Of course that was unpleasant, and I myself have lost at least one other friendship among editors I was obliged to rotate out of their roles. There has been more than enough unhappiness and bitterness in the 'Lingua episode', and I don't want to add to it.

Therefore, in accordance with your formal request that I cease to refer to you personally in messages to prospective reviewers, I shall endeavor to refrain from doing so from now on (though I make no absolute commitment on this point).

However, I do stand by everything I have written so far to Jacob and others. There are two sides to the story. You have given your side; I have been trying to present Elsevier's. I know you don't want to engage in a discussion, so to limit myself to one instance here, since you say my reference to the Lau article is misleading: yes, I understand that four articles had been accepted for that SI prior to your resignation, and that you chose not to 'break up' the SI; but that was still a choice, and you could have chosen differently.

Leaving past facts or otherwise behind for now, let's talk about the present and future. As you say, prospective authors and reviewers can judge the quality of Lingua and of other journals. But if a prospective author does decide to try to publish an article in Lingua, why should people not review that work? As more than one neutral party has said to me in connection with this affair, journals should be all about scholarship and only about scholarship. Glossa evidently has the enthusiastic support of a loyal community. What more do you need? Is it really necessary also to harm the publication efforts of Lingua authors? Can't both journals stand or fall by their scholarship alone?

Best wishes,  
Chris

Chris Pringle, MILT  
Executive Publisher – Lingua  
Elsevier  
Langford Lane  
Kidlington OX5 1GB  
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 (0)1865 843712  
Mobile: +44 (0)791 7781738  
Email: [c.pringle@elsevier.com](mailto:c.pringle@elsevier.com)  
<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/lingua>

**From:** Rooryck, J.E.C.V. [<mailto:J.E.C.V.Rooryck@hum.leidenuniv.nl>]  
**Sent:** 07 August 2017 19:01

**To:** Pringle, Chris (ELS-OXF)  
**Subject:** FW: Review invitation for LINGUA\_2017\_242

**\*\*\* External email: use caution \*\*\***

Dear Chris,

Messages such as the one below distort my role and the facts of the Lingua case. These now are sent to me with disturbing regularity, suggesting a systematic campaign of disinformation, a suggestion that is reinforced by your editorial of July 2017 in Lingua. The entire correspondence I sent to Elsevier regarding the negotiation about Lingua in October 2015, in which we asked to publish Lingua according to Fair Open Access principles, is on my public website.

Your reference to my own article with Monica Lau appearing in Lingua Jan 2017 is misleading: that article was part of a Special Issue, and the editorial team of Lingua that was in place until 31 December 2015 had decided not to break up Special Issues that already had accepted articles with copyright signed over to Elsevier. In fact, nearly the entire publication run through January 2017 was from the backlog that had been curated by the old team.

I refuse to engage in a discussion about the ‘facts’ you present about the new Lingua below: prospective authors and reviewers can judge for themselves the quality of what is published there. Certainly the difference between Lingua’s position in Google Scholar citation metrics in October 2015 and today speaks volumes.

Be that as it may, I will have to formally ask you to cease and desist referring to me in your messages to prospective reviewers, or I will undertake legal action. Enough is enough.

Sincerely,  
Johan Rooryck

---

**From:** Pringle, Chris (ELS-OXF) <[c.pringle@elsevier.com](mailto:c.pringle@elsevier.com)>  
**Sent:** 7. august 2017 12:17  
**To:**  
**Re:** RE: Sv: Review invitation for LINGUA\_2017\_242

Dear,

Thank you for your comments, which Marta has passed to me as the Executive Publisher responsible for the management of Lingua.

I understand and respect your wish to support your friends and colleagues on the former editorial board of Lingua. However, is it possible that you have a mistaken picture of the conflict you refer to?

The conflict was instigated by Johan Rooryck, who demanded that Elsevier should entirely give away ownership of the journal to him and his colleagues. His associated demand that we reduce Lingua’s fees for Open Access publication is something we might have made some

concession on, as has happened on other Elsevier journals, had negotiation been possible. But he rebuffed our Senior Vice-President's request for a meeting to discuss these matters, and in any case, the impossible demand for ownership shows he never had any serious intention of any other outcome than resignation.

I can understand Johan's wish to continue as the editor-in-chief of a journal, and I do sympathise with his unhappiness at the prospect of that ending through no fault of his own, as indeed he was doing a very good job. (Prior to his resignation, we were already in the process of implementing our editorship rotation policy; we had appointed a co-editor alongside him in preparation for ending his role as an editor.) If you regard seeking to replace a competent and effective editor after well over a decade in the role as unreasonable, then you may view Elsevier as having initiated the conflict. But I feel an objective observer would surely recognize that this was really a fight that was entirely of Johan's making, that the resignation was entirely his choice, and that he deliberately left no other way out.

It is unfortunate that so many people in the field seem to have a distorted and one-sided view of these events. It is especially unfortunate since *Lingua* is still very much alive, and in fact receiving submissions at a higher rate than under the previous regime, as for many authors it is still important to publish their work in such a renowned and established journal; and these authors are innocent victims of Johan's attempted revolution, having their publications delayed and their careers harmed by his campaign against *Lingua*. Perhaps you did not notice Johan himself co-authoring a paper with Leiden PhD student Monica Lau which was published in *Lingua* over a year after his resignation (the copyright transfer form was not signed until December 2016, and the paper could have been withdrawn at any time prior to that):

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024384116301747>

Why is it acceptable for her paper to appear in a supposedly-dead journal, but unacceptable for other less favoured authors even to get their work reviewed for it? Why was it not withdrawn and published in *Glossa*? If this conflict was really about some high principle, then that principle seems to be a conveniently flexible one.

I therefore regret your decision not to review for *Lingua*, and hope that you will reconsider it.

Yours sincerely,  
Chris Pringle, MILT  
Executive Publisher – *Lingua*  
Elsevier  
Langford Lane  
Kidlington OX5 1GB  
United Kingdom

Tel.: +44 (0)1865 843712  
Mobile: +44 (0)791 7781738  
Email: [c.pringle@elsevier.com](mailto:c.pringle@elsevier.com)  
<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/lingua>

**From:** Marta Dynel [<mailto:marta.dynel@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** 06 August 2017 08:50  
**To:** Pringle, Chris (ELS-OXF)  
**Subject:** Fw: Sv: Review invitation for LINGUA\_2017\_242

**\*\*\* External email: use caution \*\*\***

Dear Chris,

A standard case I'm addressing to you.

Best wishes,  
Marta

Prof. UL dr hab. Marta Dynel  
University of Lodz  
Institute of English Studies  
Department of Pragmatics  
<http://martadynel.com>  
[http://anglistyka.uni.lodz.pl/ZPJ?marta\\_dynel](http://anglistyka.uni.lodz.pl/ZPJ?marta_dynel)  
<http://unilodz.academia.edu/MartaDynel>  
Co-Editor-in-Chief, Lingua  
<https://www.journals.elsevier.com/lingua>