

Warning: long comment incoming—you've triggered one of my very specific niche interests.

So, I know it might not always be super clear, but here, Charlie is asking herself, "Does it hurt?" when she sees the unstable endoskeleton with silver eyes in the back of her father's workshop. Since the animatronic is frequently convulsing and twitching in a way that resembles human reactions, Charlie is both terrified and wondering if the animatronic is actually suffering. She wants to ask her father but will never be able to verbalize her distress.

What scares Charlie the most is the animatronic's constant presence (it never takes its eyes off her), its unnervingly human-like movements, and its inability to move freely.

This scene isn't random— Charlie repeatedly references this animatronic throughout the trilogy (though a bit less in TTO), to the point where The Silver Eyes is literally named after this robot. This moment helps establish a lot of important elements in the story.

First, the role of this animatronic in TSE is to develop Charlie's unique relationship with animatronics, her connection to her past, and of course, to be terrifying (it's a horror book after all).

Charlie has a very particular way of viewing animatronics throughout the trilogy. She genuinely loves them—so much so that she compares her childhood toys to her family. She also seems to judge people's trustworthiness based on their attitude toward her toys (She explicitly states in TSE that one of the major reasons she trusts John is because he has always been careful and respectful with her toys, even as an adult, and that he "understands" her through them).

At university, she specializes in robotics and is highly protective of her creations—so much that she gets upset when her friends don't share her enthusiasm. Her project is particularly telling: she wants to communicate with animatronics head and be accepted by them, which unsettles the other characters (because it's such an unusual desire).

Throughout the series, Charlie often expresses empathy and pity for animatronics (especially the Classics—the Twisted ones don't tug at the heartstrings as much). She sympathizes with the Classics for being abandoned at Fazbear's, is the only character to react negatively when her friends or William manually control them, and is introduced in TSE as hating to see her father dismantle his robots when she was a child. (In TTO, we even see her crying and begging him to stop, but I'll get back to that.)

In this scene, we see Charlie empathizing with the robot to the point where she wonders if it feels pain—despite being afraid of it. This is especially effective in TTO, as it establishes her as someone capable of pushing aside her fear for the well-being of something that most people would consider insignificant—just a hunk of metal.

This consideration for robots serves multiple purposes:

1. It helps set up the twist (obviously).
2. It makes us sympathize with Charlie as a character. Her passion and empathy for animatronics—characters that we as fans also care about—help us relate to her. It also balances out her colder attitude toward people and her difficulty in interacting with others.

3. It introduces the idea that animatronics have some form of consciousness and that more peaceful solutions are generally the best approach when dealing with them. (This is reinforced in TSE's climax, where the group doesn't defeat the Classics by outmatching them, but by recognizing them as victims and showing them empathy.)

What makes this even more striking is that the defining feature of this endoskeleton is its silver eyes, and eyes are a recurring motif throughout the trilogy. (I personally see them as a representation of a character's soul—or at least something close to that idea.)

This is emphasized in TSE, where there's an entire moment where Clay realizes that once Freddy's is haunted and the animatronics are possessed, their eyes glow with an unnatural silver light. Throughout the trilogy, Charlie frequently expresses discomfort when faced with eyes—she has a panic attack in TSE when she stumbles upon a jar of animatronic eyes, gets jumpscared by a taxidermied coyote in TTO, and even compares the stars to silver eyes. This is likely linked to her traumatic encounter with the endo, which fits well with another key theme we'll get into shortly.

What's particularly interesting is that Charlie's memory of the endo scene is recounted just before John opens up about his own trauma : witnessing Michael's kidnapping. There's a compelling parallel here: Charlie's trauma is especially tied to the vivid color of the endo's eyes—an object that seemed alive and possibly suffering—while John's trauma is tied to the absence of life in William's eyes when he was in costume, describing them as empty and dead.

I think one of the ideas here was to draw a contrast between the state of the MCI victims and William, and to highlight how Charlie (and possibly John) can perceive these nuances through their empathy and connection to these robotic beings.

Then, the use of this scene in TSE allows for the representation of the dichotomy Charlie has about her childhood. She remembers this moment in her life as spending a lot of time playing in front of her father's workshop, finding comfort there. However, one thing taints this idyllic picture: the terrifying endoskeleton in a corner of the room, which Charlie constantly keeps an eye on, yet her father completely ignores. While one could interpret this as a common childhood memory (many children are afraid of objects that seem trivial to adults), I believe the book echoes Charlie's memories in a figurative way: behind all the surface-level happiness and the colorful robots of Freddy's, there is the endoskeleton, trembling with rage and pain, constantly watching from the shadows. This is even more striking considering that this robot is in her father's workshop (where he spends most of his time) and that it is her toxic relationship with him that defines Charlie's childhood more than anything else.

The "Does it hurt?" line is extremely vague and could be a much broader question from Charlie, recalling the suffering that these animatronics will bring to her family and many others. The fact that Charlie's childhood appears idyllic on the surface but hides something much darker—something she wants to ignore but is unable to—is one of the central themes of the trilogy and recurs frequently.

I think this becomes even clearer with the two other significant scenes. First, Charlie's memory of the moment when the endoskeleton leaves her father's workshop during a storm

to confront her. Henry steps in between them, his head lowered, unable to comfort or protect Charlie, who runs away, abandoning both her father and his machine.

Then, when adult Charlie enters her father's workshop for the first time, she recalls the moment her father introduced her to the three endoskeletons of the future Freddy Fazbear's Pizza mascots. While Charlie is ecstatic about the new robots, she suddenly remembers the presence of the silver-eyed endoskeleton and turns around to see the terrifying animatronic just a few steps away. She tries to back away from it but realizes in horror that she cannot move or express her fear to her father. The memory blurs as adult Charlie begins to have a panic attack and flees the workshop.

In both cases, there is this idea of a cold, distant reality hidden beneath the surface, often tied to the fact that Charlie is unable to find comfort in her father figure. (In the context of TSE, where these two memories come from, I think this is mainly linked to Henry's suicide and how his absence in his daughter's adult life is so profound that Charlie is not even able to associate her childhood memories with him. From a broader perspective, considering the twist, it could be interpreted as Henry never having expressed true paternal love for Charlie—or, at the very least, having very mixed feelings.)

Charlie has this conversation with Jessica in TSE, which seems to perfectly summarize her detachment from the endoskeleton:

"That's the worst thing, isn't it?" Charlie said. "Things that act alive but aren't."

"What?" Jessica said.

"I mean things that look alive but aren't," Charlie said quickly.

Charlie never says that infamous phrase aloud. When she wants to communicate with her father, she finds herself literally unable to do so—not only out of fear (and a desire not to disturb him) but also due to her difficulty in expressing herself and being understood. The communication between the two characters is complicated, if not nonexistent, which stands in stark contrast to the only known scene between Henry and Charlotte (his biological daughter), where they can communicate without a single word.

I find this particularly evident in one detail: when Charlie first finishes recalling the "Does it hurt?" scene as an adult, she reflects that she now knows the answer to that question—but she does not elaborate further. As an adult, Charlie is able to rationalize her fear and understand that robots do not feel pain, that this robot does not feel anything... Right? ... After all, Charlie never actually tells us what conclusion she ultimately reached.

But if we focus solely on the trilogy's storyline, this scene ("Does it hurt?") obviously serves to set up the final twist (which, in turn, will be heavily tied to the two themes just discussed).

The endoskeleton that Charlie mistakenly interprets as Foxy is actually Circus Baby's—the fourth body of Charlie and the main antagonist of *The Fourth Closet*. I'll skip the details to focus solely on this scene, but it not only establishes Baby as an even more aggressive and personally connected antagonist to Charlie, but also quite literally represents the fact that she exists solely through the lens of rage and the abuse she previously endured (Charlie's "Does it hurt?" could thus refer to this, though this interpretation depends on Charlie's empathy toward Baby, since Charlie is obviously unaware of the endo's history). This is

especially emphasized by the fact that Circus Baby ultimately gives Charlie an answer: Yes, it hurts.

This leads to my final interpretation—the one I believe is suggested by TFC: the scene is a representation of the abuse Charlie suffered as a child. If we take the final installment into account, it seems quite clear that Charlie endured a difficult childhood that could very easily be categorized as abuse (particularly neglect). I won't go into too much detail, but if we list Henry's behaviors toward his non-biological daughter, the result is far from flattering: he manipulates her, regularly ignores her, disregards her feelings and forces emotions upon her, does not see her for who she is but rather for what she represents to him, places her under the care of untrustworthy individuals (Jenn, who initially wanted to get rid of Charlie, and William, who... well, is just William), makes her interact with objects dangerous for her age, restricts her freedoms, and, of course, attempts to murder her (perhaps I should have started with that one).

And yes, this is very likely the reason why Charlie and Elizabeth are literally dolls: because that is all they are in their fathers' eyes—objects with a function, things that can be pretty and well-dressed, but also replaced or discarded at any given moment.

The exchange between Elizabeth and Charlie, where the phrase "Does it hurt?" reappears, seems particularly interesting to me because it happens right when Elizabeth finishes her explanation with a sentence that I find very striking:

"It's rather a cruel irony that I would escape the life of one neglected daughter only to embody another."

The life of a neglected daughter that Elizabeth refers to is that of a robot created by Henry—a situation that Charlie herself understands all too well. Certainly, Baby quite clearly does not include Charlie herself in this, as Baby dehumanizes Charlie and considers her unworthy of any love. This adds another layer of irony to the situation: young Charlie worries about Baby despite her fear and despite the fact that, at that moment, Baby is nothing more than a soulless robot. Meanwhile, Baby harbors an intense hatred for Charlie, even while being aware that Charlie is likely more than just a mere doll. This irony is made even more explicit in The Fourth Closet, where Charlie shows compassion toward Elizabeth's memories of abuse, while Elizabeth, in contrast, mocks and trivializes the suffering of both Henry and Charlie.

But regardless of Baby's opinion, it is very clear that the narrative does not side with her, and that is what stands out. Charlie is a robot and yet is capable of feeling emotions—she is able to experience the same things as Elizabeth, if not more. There is no reason for us, as readers, or for the other characters in this universe, to reject Charlie solely based on her robotic nature (though I feel like I'm stating the obvious here).

What seems heavily implied in the "Does it hurt?" scene, which reappears when Elizabeth reveals to Charlie that she, too, is a robot (and that being a robot under Henry's care is painful), is that Charlie herself has experienced this suffering. When Charlie sees the endoskeleton, Baby is neither possessed by Elizabeth nor stolen by Afton—she is entirely Charlie's fourth body. Charlie is very literally asking her father whether an older version of herself is in pain.

And if Charlie asks this question when she sees Baby's body, it is because she herself feels this emotion, an emotion she struggles to verbalize or express in any way other than by redirecting it onto others. This is a pattern that is particularly evident in Elizabeth as well: she is unable to confront the true culprits of her abuse (William and Henry), so she takes it out on Charlie—who is also a victim and in no way responsible for Elizabeth's suffering.

And when you think about it, this isn't the first time Charlie has done something like this. Canonically, Charlie likely spent relatively little time with Sammy, but especially with Charlotte. It seems probable that the feelings Charlie has toward her brother are actually feelings she holds toward her sister, Charlotte (her former owner). Since her ability to conceptualize Charlotte has been mutilated by her father, she redirects these feelings toward a different person—Sammy.

This leads me to another recurring metaphor throughout the trilogy: the dismantling of animatronics. It appears frequently across all three books (in fact, it is one of the first things we learn about Charlie in Chapter 1 of *The Silver Eyes*). Charlie fears the way her father disassembles animatronics. I've already mentioned this in the context of her empathy for robots, but it is also a massive red flag regarding what Charlie experienced in her childhood. This isn't the only concerning element, and other unsettling details can be found, but I'll keep it brief.

Charlie hates seeing her father harm animatronics because she is too emotionally attached to them to understand that they do not actually feel pain when they are dismantled. To me, it is obvious that if Charlie is so afraid of this, it is because she has already experienced it herself (which is strongly implied by the existence of the secret bunker beneath Henry's house and the fact that the fourth body apparently went through this), or at the very least, she subconsciously recognizes her own status and the possibility that she could end up the same way.

In *The Twisted Ones*, Charlie recalls witnessing one such dismantling scene after rejecting a frog toy (because she was afraid of its eyes—again, the eyes). As Henry starts to comfort his daughter, holding her and speaking gently, the tone completely shifts when he begins tearing the toy apart and refuses to stop, ignoring his daughter's tearful pleas. The scene ends on a dark note, with Charlie backing into a corner of the room, forcing herself to stay as quiet as possible so as not to disturb her father with her crying.

I think we can all agree that this is far from ideal parenting.

One could even question whether the implication of this scene is that repairing and modifying robotic bodies actually causes pain to the robots possessing them (which is somewhat implied by Baby later on, as she suggests that the pain felt is physical rather than purely emotional, and this idea is also present in *Sister Location*). If that is the case, Henry's behavior here would not be so different from physical violence against children—especially given how Charlie reacts to animatronic dismantling throughout the books. However, I am more hesitant to fully adopt this interpretation. Either way, the figurative version of this idea is very present in the scene.

By constructing and dismantling his robots in this manner, Henry holds power over their lives and deaths, as well as complete control over their emotions—without seeming to realize it

(This is, to me, the key distinction between Henry and William: Henry harms his daughter more out of obliviousness than out of malice.) But Charlie feels this reality deeply: she does not always feel safe and comfortable with her father (something she even admits outright at certain points).

This scene also highlights her inability to communicate with her father: Charlie cannot openly admit that she worries about the robots, and Henry completely ignores her.

This brings me to another important point I haven't discussed much yet. One of the things that makes Charlie uncomfortable about Afton's and Henry's robots is their inability to act freely.

This is also the core point Elizabeth makes when confronting Charlie. What Baby takes away from her experience of abuse (by Henry) is the feeling of being abandoned—of having to remain constantly aware of her parent's disinterest and dissatisfaction, without being able to act on it. We know that this is something that deeply affects Charlie because she cannot stand being physically restrained and experiences violent panic attacks when she feels unable to express her inner distress (notably, this happens twice in *The Twisted Ones*, and immediately after the 'Does it hurt?' scene in *The Silver Eyes*, when she remembers her inability to speak or move). And this reaction makes perfect sense, considering that Charlie spent part of her existence as a camera and a doll—unable to move, forced to absorb false memories. (Not to mention that, again, the feeling of being powerless and unable to escape a situation is a very common representation of childhood abuse.)

I think this is another valid interpretation of *Does it hurt?*—not just as “Does it physically hurt?” but as “Does it hurt to be left behind and abandoned?”

In short, to summarize clearly: Charlie worries about the well-being of robots because, as a child (and as an adult, given the heavy trauma she carries), she is/feels like she is in a similar situation.

This makes adult Charlie's rationalization of her fear even more unsettling from this perspective. She dismisses her childhood fears by assuming they were unfounded since robots cannot feel pain and the robot likely never would have harmed her. However, both of these rationalizations are false—Charlie condescendingly dismisses her entirely valid childhood feelings in an attempt to reassure herself and forget.

In TSE, Charlie mentions that her relationship with her father is particularly complicated because she never got to grow up with him and discover his flaws and failings. I would go further and say that her perception of him is even more blurred by the tendency to idealize the dead and avoid questioning their actions (after all, they can no longer be held accountable). Adult Charlie tends to deny the difficulties she experienced as a child (which seems to be her main flaw pointed out by the plot in TSO) and tries to justify them from an "adult" perspective.

Two examples come to mind.

First, when she was a child, Charlie was taken in by her aunt Jenn, who rather coldly told her that she would not be replacing her father. Charlie interpreted this as rejection. As an adult,

she mocks herself for ever having thought that and assumes her aunt was probably just trying not to tarnish her father's memory. However, she fails to consider that her aunt's comment might have been quite harsh for a child who had already been abandoned by her mother—especially since, after the plot twist, the reader becomes aware that Jenn likely never wanted custody of Charlie and probably only agreed to take her in reluctantly. This fully validates young Charlie's feelings (without blaming Jenn, of course).

The second, and perhaps most striking, example is the memory of the frog toy being dismantled. After recalling being rejected and traumatized by her father, who was completely in the wrong in that situation, and after remembering the fear and guilt she endured (and still feels as an adult), Charlie draws only one conclusion: that her father was pragmatic. *Who would conclude that from such an experience???*

And this is not the only time Charlie describes something as "pragmatic." There's also the moment when she takes action and dismantles Theodore herself, calling her action "rational" (and when you have to convince yourself that what you're doing is "rational," that's already a bad sign). She repeatedly tells herself that what she's doing is pragmatic and that Theodore will be fine because she will "put him back together later."

This anecdote seems even more important because, this time, other characters are aware of it (John and Jessica), and they both react with deep concern for Charlie, considering that tearing apart her stuffed animal is not normal behavior. Jessica even says in TFC that it resembles a stage of grief Charlie is handling poorly, and John uses it as an example of Charlie's neurotic relationship with her childhood. And given that Charlie occasionally compares herself to Theodore... Yeah, maybe it's not a coincidence that she destroys him in a book where she slowly succumbs to her depressive tendencies.

In any case, I think the double meaning of the phrase "Does it hurt?" and its recontextualization in TFC lead to this interpretation: Charlie wants to verbalize her fear and distress about her own existence as a robot (which seems to metaphorically represent her abusive relationship with her father) but is incapable of doing so.

(If I had all the time in the world, I'd go on a tangent about her positive relationship with John, who shows great curiosity toward the animatronics and refuses to harm them, and her more complicated relationship with her father, who builds them, but maybe this is already getting a bit too long.)

I'll end this ****SHORT**** analysis with a potential reference.

It is possible that the phrase "Does it hurt?" comes from the children's story "The Velveteen Rabbit or How Toys Become Real", which Scott has referenced multiple times throughout the Fnaf series (notably in a script he shared on August 8 and in In the Flesh).

To summarize, the book tells the story of a stuffed rabbit given to a child. The other mechanical toys boast about having mechanisms or engines that make them resemble real objects (like trains and boats), making them "Real." An old toy contradicts them and explains to the rabbit that one becomes Real through the love given to them. The child grows attached to the rabbit, and he eventually becomes Real. However, the child falls ill and must part with the stuffed rabbit, which needs to be burned to ensure it doesn't carry any germs.

Before being destroyed, the rabbit is devastated to realize that becoming Real now allows him to feel pain and suffering, and he sheds a real tear. This tear transforms him into a living rabbit, and he joins the other wild rabbits.

The story shares a few similarities with Charlie's backstory, particularly the idea that the only way to become Real is through the love someone has for you. A crucial plot point in the novels is that Charlie was, in part, created out of her father's (and potentially Charlotte's) love—something that Afton cannot fully grasp or replicate. The association of "realness" with being loved and happy, rather than simply resembling something real or having real parts, is reminiscent of the climax between Baby and Charlie.

The story also ends with a forced separation between the child and his stuffed toy.

What interests us here is that, in the story, the stuffed rabbit explicitly asks the question "Does it hurt?"—and in a symbolic context that could align with the novels, as he asks whether being real causes pain:

"Real isn't how you are made," said the Skin Horse. "It's a thing that happens to you. When a child loves you for a long, long time, not just to play with, but REALLY loves you, then you become Real."

"Does it hurt?" asked the Rabbit.

"Sometimes," said the Skin Horse, for he was always truthful. "When you are Real you don't mind being hurt."

It could very well be a coincidence, but I thought it was worth noting.

ANYWAY. There you go—some analytical takes on the meaning of the phrase *"Does it hurt?"* in the novel trilogy.