

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>