

Chris Pringle to Reviewer 1:

“Some key facts which seem not to be common knowledge:

- One of the editors’ non-negotiable demands was that Elsevier should give them ownership of the journal;

- It was the editors who refused to negotiate (our Senior Vice-President’s attempt to arrange a meeting to discuss the matter with them was rebuffed)”

Johan Rooryck’s reply:

The non-negotiable demand for ownership was indeed formulated by the entire editorial team, as is clear from the initial letter sent to Elsevier (See the *Lingua* editorial team's letter of renegotiation to Elsevier to publish *Lingua* in Open Access on (what is now known as) *Fair Open Access Principles*, 7 October 2015. But this was intended as an opening move in a negotiation: any form of co-ownership was on the table for the editors. But Elsevier never responded to any of the demands with a counteroffer of any sort. See below and [Elsevier's response](#) of 16 October 2015, signed by Chris Tancock (Senior Editor, Elsevier) to the *Lingua* editorial team's letter of renegotiation of 7 October 2015). On the issue of ownership and my (foolishly) giving up royalty payments for *Lingua* in 2003, see below.

The Senior Vice-President’s attempt to arrange a meeting to discuss the matter with them [the editors] was not rebuffed. First of all, the invitation was not extended to all of the editors, just to me, the executive editor. Secondly, I did meet Senior Vice-President David Clark, at the *European Commission Workshop Alternative Open Access Publishing Models: Exploring New Territories in Scholarly Communication* in Brussels on 12 October 2015, in the presence of Natalia Grygierczyk, Head Librarian, Radboud University Nijmegen; and Gerard Meijer, President of the Association of Dutch Universities. David Clark asked me what I wanted, and I replied that I had made that clear in my letter. There was no response, not any attempt at negotiation. Gerard Meijer then reiterated the editors’ demands, putting the authority of the Association of Dutch Universities behind our renegotiation letter. Later that week, on 16 October 2015, David Clark did try to contact me by phone and mail (see [Mail correspondence](#) with David Clark). Johan Rooryck then did rebuff the request for a phone conversation, asking for all communication about this negotiation to be in writing.

Chris Pringle to Reviewer 1:

*“Why would they do this? Frankly I believe the whole episode was less about Open Access than about Johan wishing to hold on to power. We were implementing Elsevier’s new editorial rotation policy, and the sequence of events suggests that OA was his pretext to prevent us ending his editorship, as he had never raised it as an issue before. You will note that prior to the transition, we had appointed a co-editor alongside him in preparation for his rotation off; but that with the creation of *Glossa*, Johan is back in sole charge.”*

Johan Rooryck’s reply:

This is pure speculation on behalf of Chris Pringle. I had never expressed dissatisfaction at the rotation proposed by Elsevier, neither in conversation or in writing. The reason Open Access had not been raised as an issue before was that it was common knowledge that Elsevier was only interested in its own version of Open Access: expensive Article Processing Charges and ‘double dipping’. In actual fact, my interest in Open Access had been sparked by (1) the Elsevier boycott, which meant that many key prospective reviewers had started to refuse to review for *Lingua*. (2) As of 2011, Elsevier wanted to forcefully intervene in the composition of the editorial team: Chris Tancock (Senior Editor, Elsevier) had asked me very clearly to pick a new associate editor from a populous Asian country and economic powerhouse where he claimed a lot of submissions came from. As I pointed out to him, those submissions were mostly desk rejections. Of course, Elsevier just

coincidentally happened to sell a lot of new subscriptions in the populous Asian country that the new associate editor should have come from. I strongly believed that the editorial team and board should be selected on the basis of its expertise, not on the basis of nationality.

Further, how is it that I am 'back in sole charge'? *Lingua's* editorial team and board followed me to *Glossa*, and so did the entire linguistic community, on whom *Glossa* depends for articles and reviews. The journal is owned by the complete editorial team and board in an arrangement that makes this possession untransferable on an individual basis, as per the *Glossa* Constitution. This ensures that *Glossa* will always be owned by the linguistic community. I see that hardly as evidence for being in 'sole charge'.

Chris Pringle also conveniently omits that *Lingua* was only one of the journals that flipped to Fair Open Access. Two other journals also made the move: *Journal of Portuguese linguistics* and *Laboratory Phonology*, with the help of *Linguistics in Open Access (LingOA)*, a foundation created specifically for the purpose of flipping subscription journals in linguistics to Open Access. I mention this here because it again underscores how this was a group effort by various people, rather than a single rogue editor who supposedly wanted to retain 'power'.

Chris Pringle to Reviewer 2:

*"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."*

Johan Rooryck's reply:

Again, this is incorrect. The 'conflict' was not instigated by me, since the renegotiation letter was signed by the entire editorial team: the editors were united in the demands of Fair Open Access as expressed in our letter of renegotiation. As far as I know, there was also no conflict, just a request to renegotiate on our side with demands that were rebuffed by Elsevier (see [Elsevier's response](#) of 16 October 2015, signed by Chris Tancock (Senior Editor, Elsevier) to the *Lingua* editorial team's letter of renegotiation of 7 October 2015). There was an written letter of negotiation on our behalf,. By contrast, Elsevier did not even try to negotiate any single specific point of these demands, neither orally in my conversation with David Clark of 12 October 2015, not in any other written document to me or any other member of the editorial team.

Pringle's assertion that a reduction in *Lingua's* fees for Open Access 'publication is something we might have made some concession on, as has happened on other Elsevier journals', was never discussed with us. Note, by the way, that these fees have not changed: they are still in the amount of 1800 USD (<https://www.elsevier.com/journals/lingua/0024-3841/open-access-options>)

About the 'the impossible demand for ownership': it is interesting to note that until 2003, I was paid royalties in lieu of a flat fee. I still have the papers to prove it. Royalties imply at least some form of co-ownership: according to Wikipedia "A royalty is a payment made by one party, the licensee or franchisee to another **that owns a particular asset**, the licensor or franchisor for the right to ongoing use of that asset.". I did not realize the implications of changing this advantageous agreement in 2003. Some might say I was cheated out of my ownership of the journal at that time. But the editors would certainly have seriously considered any form of co-ownership that Elsevier was willing to consider. Remember this was a negotiation, and negotiations imply concessions on all sides. There is no evidence in writing or in any other way that Elsevier was willing to consider any of our demands.

As I have said above, I have not rebuffed the Senior Vice-President's request for a meeting to discuss these matters (see my correspondence on this matter with David Clark, Senior Vice-President). I met David Clark in Brussels, as mentioned before, and subsequently he wanted to discuss matters over the phone, never agreeing to my request to put things in writing (so I could share them with my associate editors). So it should be very clear that the unwillingness to enter negotiations lies squarely with Elsevier, not with the Lingua editorial team.

Chris Pringle to Reviewer 2:

"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."

Johan Rooryck's reply:

See my reply to a similar speculative assertion above. My purported wish to continue as the editor-in-chief of a journal is slanderous speculation on Pringle's behalf, and an attempt to attribute motives to me that I never had.

Chris Pringle to Reviewer 2:

"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."

Johan Rooryck's reply:

Allow me to quote from Monica Lau's statement on my Facebook page regarding this issue: "The article that Johan and I co-authored had been in the making since 2012, as part of a Special Issue, when Johan was still the Editor-in-Chief of Lingua, and when Lingua was still a respectable journal. Following the decision by the editorial team to transition to Glossa--in light of Elsevier's refusal to accept terms of fair open access for Lingua--there was considerable debate as to whether we should continue with the proposed publication of the special issue in Lingua. Following much soul-searching, we decided, as we had already committed to publication in Lingua, and, given various undertakings to this effect, both to the journal and more importantly, the contributors, that it would only be the honorable thing to do, to honor our promise, and proceed with its publication in Lingua. Withdrawal of our paper would have undermined the Special Issue as a whole. But this decision does not, in any way, mean that we supported Lingua, then or now, nor that we somehow operate double standards. We stand by our principles; it is precisely because of these, that we decided to proceed with the publication of our paper. By seizing upon the fact that we published the paper in Lingua, after Glossa had been established, as "evidence" that Johan and/or myself somehow maintain support for Lingua is both far-fetched, and frankly, preposterous. It both beggars belief, and seeks to convince the credulous, refashioning facts to fit the malicious Elsevier world-view: academics should

produce content free of charge, they should provide their reviewing service free of charge, and then, pay to get it back! This modus operandi, evident in this disingenuous impugning of Johan, is cynical, and evidences Elsevier's lack of principles when money is at stake. A similar message, to the one sent by Chris Pringle, was also sent by Marta Dynel. When I pointed out the facts, she apologized, acknowledged her misrepresentation, and promised to never resort to such tactics again, in order to convince linguists to review for Lingua. Apparently, this tactic is now systemic. It must be defeated. Only by a total boycott of the zombie Lingua will that be achieved."