



Paper: “Mehmet Rauf's Novel September: One of the first psychological novels written under the influence of Western literature and its critical analysis”

Submitted: 02 April 2025

Accepted: 12 May 2025

Published: 31 May 2025

Corresponding Author: Shorena Sultanishvili Gezgic

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2025.v21n14p25

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Salam El Baba
Beirut Arab University, Lebanon

Reviewer 2: Nedret Kuran Burcoglu
Yeditepe University, Istanbul

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Salam El Baba	
University/Country: Beirut Arab University/Lebanon	
Date Manuscript Received: April 16, 2025	Date Review Report Submitted: April 21, 2025
Manuscript Title: Mehmet Rauf's Novel <i>September</i>: One of the first novels written under the influence of Western literature and its critical analysis	
ESJ Manuscript Number:	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	
You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
The title is, in fact, clear and related to the content of the article, but it is the content of the paper, while interesting and detailed, that is misleading due to lack of clear theoretical framework.	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
The abstract presents the subject matter clearly, focusing on the analysis of the factors provoking betrayal, the origin of remorse, and the psychological portraits of characters in <i>September</i> . It also clearly positions the work in a historical timeline as one of the first psychological novels affected by Western literature.	

<p>It would be clearer for the reader if the researcher mentions which aspect of betrayal is present in the work (in the abstract).</p> <p>The abstract mentions the methodology (content analysis and critical study) but does not specify a theoretical framework or conceptual approach through which the analysis is being conducted. Question to consider: What literary theory is the researcher relying on to approach <i>September</i>?</p> <p>Further suggestion: The results are clearly stated, death being the purifier of sins, yet the results could be clarified by explaining how the novel's themes of betrayal and remorse contribute to its status as a key text in Turkish literature, beyond just stating that these themes are present.</p>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
The article is clear and well-written in a refined language with few grammatical errors.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<p>The methods (content analysis and critical study) are mentioned, but the lack of specific theoretical framework weakens the clarity of the methodology. Readers would not be aware as to how the researcher is going to approach the work under scrutiny. More depth in explaining the approach and theoretical lens would improve this aspect.</p> <p><u>Suggestion:</u> The absence of a clear theoretical framework in the paper significantly impacts its coherence and focus. The paper touches on a variety of complex topics such as psychology, morality, history, culture, and social class, but <u>without a guiding theoretical lens</u>, these aspects are presented in a somewhat scattered and confusing manner.</p> <p>As a result, readers may struggle to understand what the main focus of the analysis is. To enhance the clarity and rigor of the paper, a theoretical framework could be introduced to provide a structured approach to the analysis.</p> <p>For example, a psychological framework (Freudian psychoanalysis or Jungian psychology) could help focus on the characters' inner turmoil and emotional development.</p> <p>Alternatively, a socio-cultural framework, such as Marxist theory, could provide insight into the social class dynamics and the historical context of the Servet-i Fünun period.</p> <p>Another possible approach could be to apply New Historicism, which would allow for a deeper exploration of the novel's historical context and its interaction with the socio-political environment of the time, taking into consideration the importance of the historical background in the researcher's study.</p> <p>A Feminist perspective would shed light on how Suad navigates her life in a society that might restrict her agency, further influencing her decision not to engage in physical contact with Nejib.</p> <p><u>Side note:</u> Issues on morality and remorse could be further explained through a Nietzschean lens.</p> <p>Using one/two of these frameworks would create a clearer, more focused analysis and improve the overall structure of the paper and analysis.</p>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	3
The results of the study are presented clearly, especially in terms of how the characters' emotional and psychological states are impacted by betrayal and remorse. The conclusion about the characters' "purification" through death is a clear result of the narrative analysis.	

There don't seem to be any major logical or factual errors in the results, but since the methodology is somewhat unclear (as previously discussed), the results may lack sufficient theoretical depth or critical engagement with existing literature. Also, without a theoretical framework, the results may feel somewhat generalized or lacking in a more grounded interpretation.	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3.5
<p>The conclusion is logically tied to the content: It talks about betrayal, remorse, self-sacrifice, and how the characters' spiritual struggle culminates in death as purification – all of which are themes explored in the paper. It reinforces the key idea that psychological conflict and morality are central to the novel and are treated with emotional depth.</p> <p>However, a sense of overgeneralization cannot be ignored. The conclusion tries to touch on many aspects (spirituality, morality, psychology, symbolism of death, literary history – as it does throughout the paper) without being anchored in a single clear framework. That weakens the accuracy and consistency of the summary.</p>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	3
<p>The references include important monographs and primary sources relevant to Servet-i Fünun literature and Mehmed Rauf.</p> <p>However, the article lacks engagement with broader theoretical sources that would support its psychological or moral analysis. The inclusion of contemporary literary theories (as mentioned earlier) would enhance the academic depth.</p> <p>Additionally, while internet sources provide accessible context, more peer-reviewed academic sources should be prioritized</p>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is highly advisable that the researcher focus on a **theoretical framework** that would guide their research. Lack of methodology restricts detailed and directed analysis. It might also confuse readers due to overgeneralization and inclusion of various themes (which can all be discussed according to a literary theory).

The historical context is **fragmented** -- the connection to *September* is not fully developed. The explanation would benefit from **chronological clarity** and a clearer **thematic link** to the novel.

It is also important to give more details about the Servet-i Fünun period in the historical perspective. The paper does not explain what defines this period:

- No discussion of key figures
- No mention of the **Servet-i Fünun journal** as a cultural and literary hub.
- No details on the **political climate** at the time (censorship, repression, the rise of individualism and interiority in literature).

The discussion section would thus be developed and explained according to the theory/theories chosen by the researcher, relying on aspects and concepts from the methodology to strengthen the researcher's argument, not the researcher's personal analysis.

The paper should be filling a gap in literature that is not quite mentioned/clear. What is the researcher adding/contributing to the literature?

After choosing a theoretical framework, the **references** should be related to the theory chosen by the researcher.

The name of the work, *September*, should be italicized, not between quotations. Quotes are used for names of articles whereas names of novels, books, poems, plays, etc. should be italicized.

A **Review of Literature** could be added to strengthen the researcher's gap.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received:	Date Review Report Submitted:
Manuscript Title: Mehmet Rauf's Novel September: One of the first novels written under the influence of Western literature and its critical analysis.	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 04045/25	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	4
<i>Well formulated , concise but could be shorter.</i>	
2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	3
<i>It is correct but the literary techniques are not clearly indicated.</i>	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>The text is correctly written; but a few mistakes; some sentences need reformulating, for better clarity.</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>The methods are sated, but they are not explicit by times.</i>	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>Results are clear; there are some minor errors.</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>It is good, but it fails to remind the reader of the points which have been developed in the body.</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>They are correctly put, relevant, but some mistakes</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

The topic has been correctly elaborated but you could reinforce the analysis through the narrative techniques.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

It is a well-documented; good article.

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2025

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.

The copyrights of the report are on the publisher and the data can be used for research purposes.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: April 29,2025 Date Review Report Submitted: May 5,2025
Manuscript Title: Mehmet Rauf's Novel *September*:One of the first novels written under the influence of Western literature and its critical analysis

ESJ Manuscript Number:

You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: Yes.

You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.

You approve, this review report is available in the “review history” of the paper: Yes.

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

Questions	Rating Result [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
-----------	-----------------------------------------

1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. 5 The author explores Mehmet Rauf's novel *September's* content and style from the point of view of

the characteristics of the novels in the Western literature of the same time period and points out the similarities between them. Thus the title of the paper is very well chosen and reflects the contents of it.

2. The abstract presents objects, methods, and results.	5
The aim/object of the paper is given at the first sentence of the abstract . It's method is summed up in the second sentence , as 'content analysis', and a 'critical study of the scientific literature related to the novel itself' and the 'analysis of new tendencies in Turkish literature '. Results of the study are summed up in the sentences that follow .	
3. There are a few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	-
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	5
The Methodology section is very explicit and clear!	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	5
Yes, the author analyses the timeline and the psychology of the characters in detail and shows how the new themes for the Turkish literature such as 'forbidden love' and 'betrayal' have been introduced and handled in the novel by Mehmet Rauf and how the fatal end of the novel has been prepared by the author. Another significant point of the novel <i>September</i> is that religion has never been an issue in it, neither in the actions of the characters, nor in the contents, which is another novelty for the Turkish literature in the Servet-i Fünun period and this has also been pointed out by the author of the paper..	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	5
Yes, the conclusions are accurate, they sum up the findings of the author in the text.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5

Yes, the author has consulted several secondary literature related to the novel *September* as well as to its author Mehmet Rauf's life and to Servet-i Fünun Literature to which the novel belongs. She has also gone through internet sources related to the text, its author and its time period.

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	Accepted!
Accepted, minor revision needed	
Return for major revision and resubmission	

Reject	
--------	--

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

It is a well prepared paper. I have enjoyed reading and evaluating it. I wish you success in your career!

After the publication of your paper in ECJ, you can e-mail (nedret.kuran@gmail.com) me and ask me to send you one of my articles, entitled, "Tevfik Fikret'te Yaşam ve Sanat" published in İstanbul, in 2007, in which I had published a Questinaire (a family document!) answered by 5 Servet-i Fünun authors. One of these authors was Mehmet Rauf!