Introduction

On 18 February 1871, six-year-old Edward Lee was taken ill with 'pain in the foot, then in knees and back'. Little Edward had been 'the healthiest of the family' until about two years earlier, when he had been an in-patient at Great Ormond Street Hospital for Sick Children in London, with 'abscess on the Heel, & pains in limbs & joints'.[1] He made a good recovery and had remained well until this new bout of pain. After being sick for three days – 'hot and feverish, especially at night', when he was restless and 'in great pain'[2] – his father took him back to the Hospital for Sick Children, where the institution's founder, the physician Dr Charles West, diagnosed him with acute rheumatism and pericarditis. In September 1874, the ten-year-old girl 'S.T.' started complaining of 'severe pain at the epigastrium'.[3] 'S.T.' had always been healthy until three months before the doctor was sent for, when she had started to suffer 'of the same pain once or twice a week', a pain that progressively worsened. The pain was so severe that the girl 'soon became sallow', developed an 'abdominal aspect' and 'became quite unable to walk', eventually succumbing to convulsions and screaming fits.[4] S.T.'s symptoms led the British doctor William H. Spurgin to diagnose hysteria. Almost seventy years later, in March 1941, four-year-old Patrick, 'of pleasing appearance, well built and rather big for his age', was sent to the Hampstead War Nurseries.[5] Soon after his mother left, separation became intolerable for Patrick. He refused to eat, play and speak and had to be moved around like an automaton. After a few days, he was reduced to a state of 'compulsive formula and symptomatic actions'. Finally, Patrick entered a state of nervous compulsion, with a weak and rapid pulse, with no interest in the outside world and 'with an absolutely

[1] GOS/10/12, Dr Charles West casenotes, 1871–72, Great Ormond Street Archives.
[2] GOS/10/12, Dr Charles West casenotes, 1871–72, Great Ormond Street Archives.
[3] William H. Spurgin, 'Case of hysteria in a child aged ten years', *British Medical Journal* (2 October 1875), 555.
[4] Spurgin, 'Case of hysteria', 555.
[5] Anna Freud and Dorothy T. Burlingham, *War and Children* (Medical War Books, New York, 1943), 26.

tragic expression on his face'.[6] For the psychoanalyst Anna Freud, who was among the first to document how children suffered when separated from their parents during the Second World War, Patrick's symptoms were directly related to 'the pain of separation'.

Even though children were often deemed incapable of being able to articulate the nature and characteristics of their own suffering, the archives are full of children in pain. Children who cry out to us from the hospital, the asylum, the therapy session, the nursery and from the bombed cities of the Second World War. Their voices and the accounts of the physicians and scientists who diagnosed and treated them provide insights into the experiences of children from the past and provoke numerous questions about the perception, experience and treatment of pain in childhood. How did ideas of pain in childhood change between the 1870s and the middle of the twentieth century (the period covered by this book) and how do these shifts reflect the cultural beliefs, scientific disciplines and emotional worlds of those times? How and why did the physical and emotional discomfort of a child become understood and accepted historically, and how did this understanding lead to different kinds of clinical treatment? Which cultural elements configured the expression of children's pain? And what were the cultural conditions that made those experiences possible in the first place? This book explores these questions historically, examining the forms of objectification of painful experience and the rhetorical modalities that have enabled the cultural understanding of childhood pain, with a focus on British medical discourse from the dawn of Darwinism until the advent of the welfare state. It covers the period from the 1870s, when Darwin published his *A Biographical Sketch of an Infant* (1877), thereby opening the door to the scientific study of childhood,[7] to the end of the Second World War, when there was an major shift in the way that the environments of children's pain – the institution, the home, the street – were conceived.[8] It is, therefore, a contribution to current knowledge about both the experience of pain and the experience of childhood.

The cases of Edward, S.T. and Patrick show how, during the period under discussion, children's pain became an unstable object that acquired different properties and meanings within different clinical and scientific disciplines. In this way, similar symptoms received radically different diagnoses and treatments, so that what was seen as 'rheumatism' in the late nineteenth century was viewed as 'anxiety phenomena' by the middle of the twentieth. This book also exemplifies how the shifts in the medical concepts of pain

[6] Freud and Burlingham, *War and Children*, 26.
[7] Charles Darwin, 'A biographical sketch of an infant', *Mind*, 2 (1877), 1.
[8] On this shift, see Mathew Thomson, *Lost Freedom: The Landscape of the Child and the British Post-War Settlement* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2013), particularly chapter 3.

accompanied radical alterations in the experience and the sense-making of children's pain. Pain, therefore, does not just have a body – it also has a history.[9]

The Child in Pain

The proliferating historical analyses of medical and physiological constructions related either to suffering or to the remedies that prevent and treat it confirm that pain has become an important topic within the historiography of experience and emotions. However, despite the abundant and still-growing body of literature on the human relationship with pain, very little has been written about the historical experience of pain in children, possibly because of the methodological difficulties a history of a subjective phenomenon must confront. When the subject is studied not only as a *locus* of pain but also as a *child in pain*, this negative consideration of subjectivity is doubled: very few

[9] Numerous works providing a cultural perspective on pain have been written by scholars across various disciplines, including the following key texts: Rachel Ablow, *Victorian Pain* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2017); Sara Ahmed, 'The contingency of pain', *Parallax*, 8 (2008), 17–34; Lucy Bending, *The Representation of Bodily Pain in Late Nineteenth-Century English Culture* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 2000); David Biro, *The Language of Pain: Finding Words, Compassion, and Relief* (Norton, New York, 2010); Rod Boddice (ed.), *Pain and Emotions in Modern History* (Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2014); Rob Boddice, *Knowing Pain: A History of Sensation, Emotion, and Experience* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2023); Joanna Bourke, 'The art of medicine: languages of pain', *The Lancet*, 379 (2012), 2420–21; Joanna Bourke, *Pain and the Politics of Sympathy: Historical Reflections, 1760s to 1960s* (Utrecht University, Utrecht, 2011); Joanna Bourke, *The Story of Pain: From Prayers to Painkillers* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014); Sarah Coakley and Kay Kaufman Shelemay (eds.), *Pain and Its Transformations: The Interface of Biology and Culture* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2007); Esther Cohen, *The Modulated Scream: Pain in Late Medieval Culture* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2010); Esther Cohen, 'The animated pain of the body', *American Historical Review*, 105 (2000), 36–68; Esther Cohen, 'Towards a history of European physical sensibility: pain in the later middle ages', *Science in Context*, 8 (1995), 47–74; Cathy Gere, *Pain, Pleasure and the Greater Good* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2017); Thomas Dormandy, *The Worst of Evils: The Fight against Pain* (Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2006); Arthur Kleinman, *The Illness Narratives: Suffering, Healing and the Human Condition* (Basic Books, New York, 1988); David Le Breton, *Anthropologie de la Douleur* (Métailié, Paris, 1995); Ronald Melzak and Patrick D. Wall, *The Challenge of Pain* (Penguin, London, 1982); Javier Moscoso, *Pain: A Cultural History* (Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2012); David Morris, *The Culture of Pain* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1991); Elaine Scarry, *The Body in Pain: The Making and Unmaking of the World* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1985); Roselyne Rey, *The History of Pain* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995); Susan Sontag, *Regarding the Pain of Others* (Hamish Hamilton, London, 2003); Susan Sontag, *Illness as Metaphor* (Allen Lane, London, 1979); Andrew Wear, 'Perceptions of pain in seventeenth century England', *Society for the Social History of Medicine Bulletin*, 36 (1985), 7–9; and Lisa Wynne Smith, 'An account of an unaccountable distemper: the experience of pain in early eighteenth century England and France', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 41 (2008), 459–80.

scholars of science have attempted to approach children's subjectivity and recognise its irreducible autonomy.[10]

Under similar coordinates, the ostensible referent of pain might seem doomed to invisibility – children are deemed incapable of properly articulating the nature and characteristics of their suffering. By exploring the attribution of meaning to children's pain from a historical perspective, this book contributes to historiographical debates about the experience of harm. Situated between cultural history and the history of science, this study asserts that the persuasive forms used to relate to others' experiences of pain are especially important in cases of individuals who either lack the ability to speak (such as animals) or who lack verbal dexterity (such as children).[11] To cover this difficult topic, the study explores the physical, emotional and performative dimensions of pain from a cultural perspective – that is, it seeks to explore the relationship between the experience of pain in childhood and the social perception of that experience. This approach enables the understanding of how and why the physical and emotional discomfort of a child became understood and accepted historically, and how it led to clinical treatment and, in some cases, financial support. Through an analysis of written narratives and visual culture, this book emphasises the performative nature of pain as it was enacted in different contexts such as the hospital, the war nursery and the asylum. The drama of pain twists and turns behind and around the child in pain – usually a secondary subject of inquiry – and the sympathetic, impassive or oblivious onlookers, as each of them imbued pain with different meanings, values and emotions, thereby presenting pain as a by-product of a heterogeneous activity. For

[10] A notable exception is Matthew Daniel Eddy, who has framed the voice of the child in archival studies of infant writing. See Matthew Daniel Eddy, *Media and the Mind: Art, Science, and Notebooks as Paper Machines, 1700–1830* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2023). See also 'The child writer: graphic literacy and the Scottish educational system, 1700–1820', *History of Education*, 45 (2016), 695–718; 'The interactive notebook: how students learned to keep notes during the Scottish Enlightenment', *Book History*, 19 (2016), 87–131; 'The shape of knowledge: children and the visual culture of literacy and numeracy', *Science in Context*, 26 (2013), 215–45.

[11] For a discussion on animal pain, see: Bernard E. Rollin, *The Unheeded Cry: Animal Consciousness, Animal Pain and Scientific Change* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1989) especially chapters 5, 6, and 7; Rob Boddice, *Humane Professions: The Defense of Experimental Medicine, 1876–1914* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021). On animal pain and anaesthesia, see: Rob Boddice, 'Species of compassion: aesthetics, anaesthetics and pain in the physiological laboratory', *Interdisciplinary Studies in the Long Nineteenth Century*, 15 (2012), 1–22; Tarquin Holmes and Carrie Friese, 'Making the anaesthetised animal into a boundary object: an analysis of the 1875 Royal Commission on Vivisection', *History and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 42 (2020), 1–28; Tarquin Holmes, 'Science, sensitivity and the sociozoological scale: constituting and complicating the human–animal boundary at the 1875 Royal Commission on Vivisection and beyond', *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, Part A, 90 (2021), 194–207; Shira Shmuely, *The Bureaucracy of Empathy: Law, Vivisection, and Animal Pain in Late Nineteenth-Century Britain* (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY, 2023).

instance, in the children's nurseries of the Second World War, the child in pain became a symbol of national resistance and courage in the face of the Blitz. If, as David Morris argues, pain is subjected to historical changes, this book addresses the nature of these shifts and how they are configured.[12]

In looking at the figure of the child through the topic of pain, this book offers an approach informed by the history of medicine, the history of childhood and the history of science, yet it is also grounded in the history of emotions and the history of people's experiences. In these already interdisciplinary fields, scholars theorise about the relationships between power, materiality and inequality in the making of cultural worlds. Taken together, these different areas of study provide indispensable tools for critical thought that can confront the cultural domination of existing hierarchies. Indeed, this book would not be possible without the already massive body of work of theorists who have articulated how the facts, institutions, technologies and meanings that comprise our bodies and worlds simultaneously exert power and exist in a situation of fluid contingency.[13] In looking at the history of childhood through pain, one can see how children's experiences become the locus of ideological and disciplinary battle. Supplementing the most frequent methods that historians of science have used to shed light on hidden subjectivities, the present study draws on theoretical resources from interdisciplinary work. The objective is to bring childhood into the heart of discussions concerning the construction of historically situated cultural assumptions about human nature, medicine and the nature of suffering. Consequently, I juxtapose scientific figurations of the child in pain with those of other cultural contexts.[14] By engaging in a comparative study between different disciplines – physiology, paediatrics, psychiatry, psychology, and psychoanalysis – this book studies the various ways in which the child in pain came into being as a figure, as well as the many forms this figure has then generated. The construction of medical and scientific

[12] See Morris, *Culture of Pain*, 1–9.

[13] The approaches of several writers have proved particularly useful in informing my approach. In the first instance is Foucault's work on power and knowledge, in particular *Discipline and Punish*, and his work on the birth of the clinic. See Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Allen Lane, London, 1977) and Michel Foucault, *The Birth of the Clinic* (Taylor & Francis, Abingdon, 2002). More relevant has been the work of other authors who, though taking their lead from Foucault, have worked in this particular direction. Ian Hacking's reflections on the philosophical uses of history, especially the insightful model offered in *Historical Ontology* (2002), has aided my efforts to understand the historicity of core epistemological referents such as 'objectivity', 'demonstration' and 'explanation'. See Ian Hacking, *Historical Ontology* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002). For more on this topic, see also: Ian Hacking, *Mad Travelers: Reflections on the Reality of Transient Mental Illnesses* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002); Ian Hacking, *Rewriting the Soul: Multiple Personality and the Sciences of Memory* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1998).

[14] This concept was developed by Claudia Castañeda. See Claudia Castañeda, *Figurations: Child, Bodies, Worlds* (Duke University Press, Durham, NC, 2002).

models of childhood pain reflects and creates a series of paradoxes and tensions in relation to the emergence and consolidation of the various scientific disciplines. The book also advances a strong claim: that the disciplines of physiology, paediatrics, psychiatry, psychology and psychoanalysis never agreed on a standard and unified theory of the child in pain. Instead, the interests of each individual discipline prefigured the way it explained and represented this figure.

This book examines the politics of diagnosis, through which the institution of medicine ascribes meaning or value to different states of pain and suffering, which in turn makes it possible to unveil or reconstruct the sense-making experiences of patients. In other – more explicitly Foucauldian – terms, the examination of authoritative medical discourses allows the framing of specific biopolitics that affect children in situations of harm, while the disciplinary archaeology operating within the margins of an interdisciplinary historical examination constitutes a taxonomy of bodies of knowledge that adopts a critical stance towards those institutionalised practices. At the same time, this approach opens a window that empowers the contemporary subject to deconstruct the often invisible discourses on the nature of pain, suffering and healing. The central argument is that, on the basis of the same symptoms or expressive signs, each discipline constructed its own figurations of childhood: the child without pain, the sick child, the insane child, the nervous child and the uprooted child. These different figurations, in turn, played a unique and constitutive role in the adult construction of worlds, particularly the worlds of nature and culture. To put it simply, the approach adopted in each chapter follows two lines. First, it describes the constellation of practices, materialities and knowledge through which a specific figure arises and is consolidated in the context of disciplines and epistemic communities. Second, it unveils how that figure contributes to broader cultural claims, both within and beyond the disciplinary realms.

One of the justifications for this book's focus on the perceptions and practices of physicians and scientists regarding pain is that there are few surviving narratives of children's personal experiences of pain. The detailed examination of the ways in which leading British physicians understood pain does not imply any wish to downplay or invalidate the experiences of pain suffered by the patients themselves. Rather, I suggest, understanding how medical professionals viewed their little patients' pain is a valid and worthy subject in its own right, particularly because their understanding of pain played an important role in influencing their treatments and in making decisions about their patients, including whether any intervention was necessary.

In a book that covers different disciplines over nearly a century, it is not possible to adopt a uniform approach to sources or their modulations. The subject of this book – pain in childhood – is addressed by a loose community

of 'scientists' that includes evolutionary theorists, physiologists, medical doctors, public-health officials, political gurus, eugenicists, psychiatrists and psychoanalysts. What unites the disparate band is an interest in the scientific study of childhood. I suggest that the diversification of knowledge about the human body and its treatment that took place during the nineteenth century and that was consolidated in the twentieth century turned children's pain into an unstable object that was invested with different properties and meanings in each discipline: pain as a sign of illness, as a symptom of an organic lesion, as an element of a child's emotional development and even as an aspect of a nation's fortitude. In all cases, the study and understanding of pain follows the same sequence: examining the subject as a sign, taking it as evidence and finally considering it as a fluctuating object of a new science. A similar process can be observed in the intellectual understanding of pain, whether in science, medicine, philosophy, the social sciences or religion. While to the general scientist, pain might be a series of complex neural circuits, a medical professional might see the patient's experience of pain more than a mere electrical sensation, while the historian or social scientist might focus on how humankind's views of pain have changed from the idea that it is something that might be good for us (whether to build character, to encourage a change of behaviour or to build up our defences to cope with stronger pain), and whether today the lack of a 'meaning' in pain has reduced our ability to cope with it. In this context, I suggest that the figure of the child in pain appears in medical, scientific and popular discourses both in its own right and as a bodily theatre through which other stories are told. In so doing, I also suggest that the history of childhood is important not only with respect to children's experiences but also as a way to understand how adult worlds are created and to deepen our understanding of the history of medicine and the emotions.[15] Asking how and why the figure of the child in pain has been used and categorised for wider cultural endeavours makes the child the focus of an analysis about how it has been deployed and valued in adult discourses.

[15] For a discussion on how the history of childhood might influence the history of emotions see Stephanie Olsen, 'The history of childhood and the emotional turn', *History Compass*, 15 (2017), e12410. See also Kristine Alexander, Stephanie Olsen and Karen Vallgårda, *Voices and Sources: Lessons from the History of Childhood, Digital Handbook of the History of Experience* (Research Council of Finland's Centre of Excellence in the History of Experiences (HEX), 2023), https://researchprofiles.ku.dk/en/publications/voices-and-sources-lessons-from-the-history-of-childhood. Stephanie Olsen, 'The limits of experience? A case study on children's dreams', *Digital Handbook of the History of Experience* (2022), https://researchportal.tuni.fi/en/publications/the-limits-of-experience-a-case-study-on-childrens-dreams. For a discussion on the role of emotions in researching children in the archives see Jack Hodgson, 'Historians, emotions, and children's trauma in the archives', *Qualitative Inquiry*, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/10778004231200265

Just as pain is a concept that does not have a single universal meaning, childhood has been seen differently across cultures and periods. The age at which 'children' are deemed to become 'adults' varies, and across the world today much variation can still be seen, both in legal terms and in practical ways.[16] In the period covered in this book, childhood was valued in terms of personal maturation, initially in a physical sense dominated by 'biological benchmarks', but increasingly regarding psychological transformation into adulthood.[17] For the purposes of this book, childhood covers the period from birth to puberty or adolescence.[18] The guiding principle here is drawn from medical treatises that make a distinction between childhood and puberty based on sexual development, which gives rise to a series of illnesses that are not suffered by children. However, this frontier is culturally bound and fuzzy, as the sexual element in puberty can be stimulated or deflected vis-à-vis the cultural conditions of a particular moment.[19] More generally, childhood is far from being a stable essentialised concept, as the extensive variations and partial overlaps between English words for non-adults show ('child', 'kid', 'infant', 'baby' and so on).[20]

Several recent historical studies of children have highlighted the fact that the adult population had a vested interested in the development of 'normal' healthy children for the continuation of national economic and political status, focusing on the significance of children as future citizens of the British Empire.[21] An analysis of the motivating factors shaping approaches to pain in childhood supports this argument to a degree. It was often a reason publicly

[16] For a discussion of age as a category of historical analysis, see Anna Davin, 'What is a child?', in Anthony Fletcher and Stephen Hussey (eds.), *Childhood in Question: Children, Parents and the State* (Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1999), 14–36; and the first edition of *Journal of the History of Childhood and Youth* 1 (2008), particularly: Steven Mintz, 'Reflections on age as a category of historical analysis', 91–94; Leslie Paris, 'Through the looking glass: age, stages, and historical analysis', 106–13, Peter Stearns, 'Challenges in the history of childhood', 35–42.

[17] For further analysis of this aspect of childhood see Castañeda, *Figurations*.

[18] The term adolescence is historically imprecise and only began to gain prominence in the late nineteenth century, culminating in G. Stanley Hall's formalization of the concept in his seminal work, Adolescence: Its Psychology and Its Relations to Physiology, Anthropology, Sociology, Sex, Crime, Religion and Education (D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1904).

[19] Sally Shuttleworth, *The Mind of the Child: Child Development in Literature, Science, and Medicine, 1840–1900* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010), 10.

[20] Davin, 'What is a child?'.

[21] For an account on the significance of children as future citizens, see: Anna Davin, 'Imperialism and motherhood', *History Workshop Journal*, 5 (1978), 9–65; Deborah Dwork, *War Is Good for Babies and Other Young Children: A History of the Infant and Child Welfare Movement in England, 1898–1918* (Tavistock, London, 1987); Bernard Harris, *The Health of the Schoolchild: A History of the School Medical Service in England and Wales* (Open University Press, Buckingham, 1995); Harry Hendrick, 'Child labour, medical capital, and the school medical service, c.1890–1918', in Roger Cooter (ed.), *In the Name of the Child: Health and Welfare 1880–1940* (Routledge, London, 1992), 45–71; Stephanie Olsen, *Juvenile Nation: Youth,*

presented by different individuals and groups as their source of concern, particularly in the earlier decades of the twentieth century, when issues of eugenics and social hygiene were still prominent.[22] Harry Hendrick suggests that one defining characteristic of the category of children is that they have no political significance.[23] While it is true that individual children did not have the power to vote, this study aims to show that children were of immense political significance, and not only when adults debated child labour policy in the industrial West. In seeking to analyse historical variations in the notions of childhood, Anna Davin has argued that the attainment of adult status and adult authority is confirmed through control and/or support of children. In addition, adults have had the power to set the terms of childhood according to their priorities in the present and for the future.[24] This study confirms this view by showing that, in many cases, the agents placing emphasis on the health of children in relation to the future of the UK often had different agendas, with alternative motivations, as they used the issue of child health and welfare for political or professional advancement.

Since the early 1990s, the historiography of childhood has swelled. Historians have engaged in the continuing study of the evolution of childhood as a concept, mapping out the social, cultural, economic and political context of the 'birth of the modern child'.[25] These efforts have highlighted the absence

Emotions and the Making of the Modern British Citizen, 1880–1914 (Bloomsbury Academic, New York, 2014); Michal Shapira, *The War Inside: Psychoanalysis, Total War, and the Making of the Democratic Self in Post-War Britain* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013); and G. R. Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899–1914* (University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971).

22 For the general context of early eugenicists, see Daniel Pick, *Faces of Degeneration: A European Disorder, c.1848–c.1918* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989), 216–21 and Alison Bashford and Phillipa Levine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Eugenics* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010). For further reviews of the field, see: Peter Bowler, *The Mendelian Revolution: The Emergence of Hereditarian Concepts in Modern Science and Society* (Athlone, London, 1989); Frank Dikötter, 'Race culture: recent perspectives on the history of eugenics', *American Historical Review*, 103 (1998), 467–78; Pauline M. H. Mazumdar, *Eugenics, Human Genetics and Human Failings: The Eugenics Society, Its Sources and Its Critics in Britain* (Routledge, London, 1992); Robert A. Nye, 'The rise and fall of the eugenics empire: recent perspectives on the impact of biomedical thought in modern society', *Historical Journal*, 36 (1993), 687–700; G. R. Searle, *Eugenics and Politics in Britain, 1900–1914* (Noordhoff International, Leyden, 1976); Richard Soloway, *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain* (University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1990); Mathew Thomson, *The Problem of Mental Deficiency: Eugenics, Democracy, and Social Policy in Britain c.1870–1959* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998); and Marius Turda, 'Recent scholarship on race and eugenics', *Historical Journal*, 51 (2008), 1115–24.

23 Harry Hendrick, *Children, Childhood and English Society* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997), 3.

24 Davin, 'What is a child?'.

25 Academic studies on the historical development of the concept of childhood include: Hugh Cunningham, *Children and Childhood in Western Society since 1500* (Longman, London,

of adequate representations and understanding of children's experience in the historic forms of medical and scientific disciplines.[26] The effect of these varied ideas of childhood on the lives of children has been the focus of recent work on the history of childhood and the history of emotions.[27] Nonetheless, the question of the child has rarely been considered in wider theoretical debates, and theorists have paid limited attention to the function and roles of the figurations of childhood in the making of adult worlds, resulting in consequences that conflict with the interests of those the category purports to represent.[28] As Claudia Castañeda has pointed out, this lack of attention to childhood is significant because it means that children are not placed at the centre of social, political and cultural concerns.[29] I align myself with this approach and attempt to reveal the processes grounded in scientific figurations and artistic representations that have shaped the cultural understanding of children's experience of pain.

Although the category 'child' includes actual children and their experiences, this book does not specifically address that relationship. Although I am convinced that these assumptions affected children, it is not my aim to explain how this might have occurred. This book is, rather, about the creation of different figures of the child in pain and their multiple uses across various cultural sites. It argues that the study of the different categories of children's pain provides an important context for understanding the emergence of other discourses on childhood in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It also offers an opportunity to explore the boundaries of psychiatry, physiology, paediatrics, psychology and psychoanalysis during this period. The scientific texts

1995); Hugh Cunningham, *The Invention of Childhood* (BBC Books, London, 2006); Lloyd De Mause (ed.), *The History of Childhood: The Untold Story of Child Abuse* (Psychohistory Press, New York, 1974); Colin Heywood, *A History of Childhood: Children and Childhood in the West from Medieval to Modern Times* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2001); Hendrick, *Children, Childhood and English Society*; Allison James and Alan Prout, *Constructing and Reconstructing Childhood: Contemporary Issues in the Sociological Study of Childhood* (Routledge, London, 1997); Peter Stearns, *Childhood in World History* (Routledge, London, 2009); Shuttleworth, *Mind of the Child*; Carolyn Steedman, *Strange Dislocations: Childhood and the Idea of Human Interiority, 1780–1930* (Virago Press, London, 1995); and Joseph L. Zornado, *Inventing the Child: Culture, Ideology, and the Story of Childhood* (Routledge, Oxford, 2006).

[26] A notable exception is Hannah Newton, *The Sick Child in Early Modern England, 1580–1720* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012).

[27] See: Stephanie Olsen, *Childhood, Youth and Emotions in Modern History: National, Colonial and Global Perspectives* (Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 2015); Olsen, *Juvenile Nation*; Ute Frevert, Pascal Eitler, Stephanie Olsen, et al., *Learning How to Feel: Children's Literature and the History of Emotional Socialization, 1870–1970* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2014).

[28] For exceptions, see: Castañeda, *Figurations*; Jacqueline Rose, *The Case of Peter Pan, or the Impossibility of Children's Fiction* (Macmillan, London, 1984); Shapira, *The War Inside*; Olsen, *Juvenile Nation*; and Steedman, *Strange Dislocations*.

[29] Castañeda, *Figurations*, 4.