Emoji as Modern Hieroglyphics: A Comparative Analysis of Ancient Egyptian Writing Systems and Contemporary Digital Communication

Abstract

This study investigates recurring semiotic patterns between Ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics and modern emoji, focusing specifically on how visual elements persist in written communication across vastly different technological eras. I reject simplistic equations between these systems, but argue that examining their functional similarities reveals something fundamental about human communication needs. Building on work from Barthes (1977) and contemporary digital communication scholars like McCulloch (2019), I show how both systems exhibit economic efficiency, cultural embedding, and aesthetic dimensions that speak to deeper patterns in multimodal expression. My comparative approach challenges linear narratives of writing system evolution and contributes to emerging scholarship on digital communication. Despite their obvious differences in complexity and purpose, both hieroglyphics and emoji reflect a stubborn human resistance to purely abstract text—a finding with implications for how we conceptualize writing system development and digital communication practices. Rather than seeing emoji as a regression to pictographic writing, I reframe them as the latest iteration of our enduring impulse toward visual-verbal hybridization.

Introduction

For decades, linguistics has clung to a comforting narrative about writing systems—that they evolved from crude pictographs toward sophisticated alphabets, shedding their visual baggage along the way. It's a tidy story. It's also wrong.

The explosion of emoji in digital communication has thrown this neat evolutionary model into disarray. When Japanese designer Shigetaka Kurita created the first emoji set in 1999, he couldn't have known he was rekindling an ancient debate about the relationship between words and images. Yet here we are, twenty-six years later, with tiny pictographs infiltrating our texts, emails, and social media posts, suggesting that perhaps our relationship with visual communication is more complicated than we thought.

Let me be blunt about what this paper isn't: it's not claiming emoji are "modern hieroglyphics." Such comparisons are intellectually lazy and historically ignorant. Egyptian hieroglyphics were a complete writing system with sophisticated grammatical structures and phonetic components that developed over three millennia (Loprieno 1995). Emoji are supplementary markers that add emotional context to existing alphabetic systems. Anyone who equates them fundamentally misunderstands both.

What interests me, however, is why serious linguistic scholarship has been so reluctant to engage with emoji at all. When I began this research, most academic treatments of emoji were either dismissive footnotes or panicked warnings about linguistic regression. The few exceptions (Danesi 2016; Stark and Crawford 2015) stood out precisely because they treated emoji as worthy of serious analysis.

This scholarly skittishness reflects what Androutsopoulos (2011: 47) calls linguistics' traditional privileging of "verbal expression while marginalizing the visual dimension of communication." We've constructed artificial boundaries between words and images that don't match how people actually communicate—boundaries that a comparative analysis of hieroglyphics and emoji helps us reconsider.

My theoretical framework draws from several fields. From semiotics, I borrow Barthes' (1977) approach to analyzing how images and text create meaning together. From media ecology comes McLuhan's (1964) insight that different technological environments shape communication in patterned ways. And from multimodal discourse analysis, I take Kress and van Leeuwen's (2001) methods for analyzing the integration of visual and verbal elements.

Four questions guide my investigation:

1. How do hieroglyphics and emoji handle the functional integration of pictorial and linguistic elements?

2. In what ways do both systems reflect economic principles of communicative efficiency?

3. How do power structures shape who controls, accesses, and appears in these pictorial systems?

4. What might the persistence of visual elements in writing teach us about human communication needs?

The stakes here go beyond academic hair-splitting. If emoji aren't just cute decorations but reflect fundamental patterns in how humans communicate, we might need to rethink how we design digital communication tools, teach literacy, and conceptualize writing itself.

I'm not the first to notice similarities between ancient and digital visual systems. Popular tech journalism occasionally trots out headlines like "Are Emoji the New Hieroglyphics?" (usually followed by facile comparisons that would make any Egyptologist cringe). What's missing is rigorous comparative analysis that respects both the differences and the functional parallels between these systems.

The knee-jerk academic dismissal of emoji mirrors historical patterns we should have learned from by now. Scholars once dismissed novels as frivolous entertainment corrupting serious literature. Film was just recorded theater until cinema studies legitimized it. And as Gawne and McCulloch (2019: 2) wryly note, "scholarly dismissal of new communication technologies has a long and undistinguished history." I'd prefer not to join that parade of missed opportunities.

So while maintaining clear-eyed awareness of the vast differences between these communication systems, I invite you to consider what their functional similarities might reveal about enduring patterns in human expression—patterns that might help us better understand not just emoji, but the fundamental human impulse to supplement our words with images.

Historical Continuity in Visual-Textual Communication Systems

The conventional story of writing system evolution goes something like this: humans started with crude pictures, gradually formalized them into pictograms, eventually developed phonetic elements, and finally arrived at the promised land of alphabetic efficiency. It's a narrative that portrays visual elements as training wheels to be discarded once "real" writing develops.

The problem? It's largely bullshit.

Hieroglyphics: Way More Complex Than You Think

Ask most people about Egyptian hieroglyphics, and they'll mutter something about pictures representing words. Even some introductory linguistics textbooks perpetuate this oversimplification. The reality is far messier and more interesting.

When hieroglyphics emerged around 3200 BCE, they already combined pictographic, ideographic, and phonetic elements in a complex system. By its maturity, the system comprised approximately 700 distinct characters with multiple functions (Allen 2014). Only about a quarter of hieroglyphs functioned as pure pictographs—most served phonetic functions or worked as semantic determinatives to clarify meaning (Ritner 1996).

"The standard narrative of writing system evolution is not merely simplistic but fundamentally misleading," grumbles Loprieno (1995: 12) in his definitive work on Ancient Egyptian linguistics. "Hieroglyphic writing exhibits semiotic sophistication that makes a mockery of linear evolutionary models."

What's particularly fascinating about hieroglyphics is their stubborn refusal to abandon visual representation even as they developed sophisticated phonetic capabilities. Unlike other writing systems that gradually shed iconic elements, hieroglyphics maintained visual representation as a core feature for three thousand years. Goldwasser (1995: 58) suggests this wasn't accidental but reflected "a conscious resistance to complete abstraction."

Consider the determinative signs. These silent semantic markers weren't pronounced but clarified meaning by placing words in conceptual categories. A walking-legs determinative indicated motion verbs; a papyrus-roll marked abstract concepts. These visual elements weren't developmental leftovers but sophisticated semantic tools that persisted throughout the system's history.

Why Do Visual Elements Keep Showing Up?

If pictorial elements were just a primitive stage of writing, why do they keep reappearing across cultures and time periods? Why didn't we just evolve toward pure alphabetic efficiency and call it a day?

Semiotic theory offers one explanation. Eco (1976: 28) suggests that visual elements provide communicative shortcuts that text alone cannot match: "A good iconic sign is to a corresponding verbal syntagm what an elegant mathematical formula is to pages of verbal demonstration." In other words, sometimes a picture really is worth a thousand words.

Media ecology provides another angle. Different technological environments create different communicative possibilities. McLuhan (1964) argued that communication technologies reshape not just how we express thoughts but the thoughts themselves. Under this view, hieroglyphics and emoji aren't historically linked but are separate manifestations of similar human impulses shaped by their technological contexts.

I find particularly useful Derrida's (1976) critique of "phonocentrism"—the Western philosophical bias that privileges speech over writing and treats writing as merely a transcription of speech. Both hieroglyphics and emoji incorporate visual elements that exceed what can be captured in speech, challenging this hierarchy. They demonstrate what Mitchell (1994: 89) calls "the complex interplay of pictorial and linguistic features that never fully resolve into pure abstraction."

It's the Medium, Stupid

We can't understand why writing systems take the forms they do without considering their material contexts. Hieroglyphics developed forms suited to stone carving and papyrus, balancing legibility, speed, and religious significance. As Baines (2012: 15) points out, "The visual format of hieroglyphic writing wasn't just decorative frippery but integral to its cultural meaning."

Similarly, emoji developed within the constraints of early mobile phones—tiny screens with limited resolution. Kurita's original 12x12 pixel grid necessitated extreme simplification, creating the distinctive aesthetic that persists even as screens have improved. The material shapes the message in ways we often overlook.

This technological embeddedness helps explain the different manifestations of pictorial elements across time. The constant isn't the specific form but the human impulse to supplement abstract symbols with visual elements. What looks like historical regression or

progression might actually be the same cognitive patterns playing out through different technological affordances.

Cognitive archaeologist Malafouris (2013: 69) takes this further, arguing that "material engagement in meaning-making isn't just cultural window dressing on top of evolved cognitive capacity but constitutive of human cognition itself." In plainer terms: the drive to incorporate visual elements into writing might be baked into our cognitive architecture.

Not Just Egypt and Japan

I've focused on hieroglyphics and emoji, but similar patterns appear across writing systems. Chinese characters maintained pictorial elements while developing sophisticated phonetic components. Maya glyphs combined logographic and syllabic elements with visual representation. Even our supposedly "pure" alphabetic systems incorporate visual elements through typography, punctuation, and text formatting.

This cross-cultural persistence further undermines simplistic evolutionary models. If pictographic elements were just a developmental stage, why do they keep showing up across unrelated writing systems? Why do new technologies like emoji consistently reintroduce visual elements alongside text?

Bolter and Grusin (2000: 21) offer a compelling explanation through their theory of remediation: "What's new about new media comes from the particular ways they refashion older media and the ways older media refashion themselves to answer the challenges of new media." Communication technologies don't develop in a vacuum but through complex processes of adaptation, reaction, and reimagining.

I want to be crystal clear: I'm not claiming direct historical connections between hieroglyphics and emoji. They emerged in completely different contexts, serve different functions, and operate through different mechanisms. What fascinates me is how they both reflect recurring patterns in human communication—patterns that suggest our relationship with visual representation is more fundamental than our traditional models of writing system evolution acknowledge.

The Emoji Phenomenon: Contemporary Manifestation of Visual Supplementation

In 1999, Shigetaka Kurita got frustrated with the limitations of text-based digital communication. Working for Japanese mobile provider NTT DoCoMo, he created a set of 176 simple 12x12 pixel images to help users convey emotions and concepts that text alone struggled to express (Blagdon 2013). He couldn't have anticipated that these tiny pictographs would become a global communication phenomenon, embedded in operating systems worldwide and expanding to over 3,600 standardized characters.

Nor could he have known that he was creating the latest chapter in humanity's long, complicated relationship with visual communication.

Not Your Egyptian Great-Grandfather's Pictographs

Emoji didn't emerge from a linguistic vacuum. They appeared in a world already saturated with alphabetic writing, addressing specific limitations of digital text communication. Unlike hieroglyphics, which developed as a complete writing system capable of expressing the full range of linguistic meaning, emoji function primarily as supplements to existing text.

"Emoji don't replace language, they enhance it," argues McCulloch (2019: 176) in her analysis of internet language patterns. "No one writes solely in emoji because emoji aren't designed to replace language—they're designed to supplement it."

What makes emoji distinctive is not their pictorial nature per se, but their emergence within an already established alphabetic context. They represent not a return to pictographic writing but a specific response to the limitations of text-based digital communication. As Stark and Crawford (2015: 3) put it, "Emoji don't replace alphabetic literacy but supplement it with affective dimensions that written language often struggles to convey in digital contexts."

In some ways, emoji function more like punctuation or typographic features than like words. Just as an exclamation point adds emotional intensity without changing the semantic content of a sentence, the crying-laughing emoji (😂) adds emotional context without replacing verbal content. The difference is that while punctuation is limited to a small set of standardized marks, emoji offer a vast and growing vocabulary of emotional and conceptual markers.

What Are Emoji Actually For?

When I first started researching emoji, I was struck by how many academic papers began by asking whether emoji constituted a "language." It's the wrong question entirely—like asking whether music notation is a "language" instead of analyzing its specific communicative functions.

Herring and Dainas (2017) identify six primary functions of emoji in digital communication:

1. Emotional indicators
2. Tone markers
3. Illocutionary force indicators
4. Identity markers
5. Relationship maintenance signals
6. Playful elements

Look closely at this list, and you'll notice something striking: most of these functions involve aspects of communication that we express non-verbally in face-to-face interaction. Emoji stepped into what Walther and D'Addario (2001) called the "cues filtered out" problem of

text-based digital communication—the absence of facial expressions, gestures, and vocal intonation that typically supplement in-person speech.

In the early days of the internet, people cobbled together emoticons from keyboard characters to add emotional context to text: the sideways smiley face :-) became a way to signal jokes or friendliness. Emoji represent the formalization and expansion of this impulse, providing standardized visual elements that add paralinguistic information to text.

This function bears interesting comparison to determinatives in hieroglyphic writing—signs that didn't have phonetic value but clarified the meaning or category of other signs. Both systems use visual elements to add semantic and emotional precision without requiring additional verbal components. The difference lies in their relationship to the primary writing system—determinatives were integral components of hieroglyphic writing, while emoji supplement our existing alphabetic systems.

Economic Principles and Communicative Efficiency

Both hieroglyphics and emoji demonstrate what linguists call the "economy principle"—the tendency of language to maximize meaning while minimizing effort. Hieroglyphic writers developed ligatures and abbreviated forms to increase writing speed; emoji allow digital communicators to compress emotional context into single characters.

Consider how much text it would take to express what a single "tears of joy" emoji (😂) conveys: "I find this extremely funny, to the point of crying, but in a positive way, and I want you to know I'm laughing appreciatively rather than mockingly." That's 27 words replaced by a single character. Talk about compression!

This efficiency explains part of emoji's explosive popularity. As McCulloch (2019: 171) observes, "A single emoji can replace entire phrases of affective clarification." In a world of character limits and rapid-fire exchanges, this economy of expression provides significant communicative advantages.

But it would be a mistake to see emoji as merely functional. Like hieroglyphics, which combined practical communication with aesthetic and religious dimensions, emoji often exceed purely utilitarian purposes. The careful selection and arrangement of emoji reflects aesthetic considerations and cultural knowledge that transform them from mere tools into forms of cultural expression.

Technological Constraints Shape Visual Systems

The material context of emoji profoundly shapes their form and function. The small screen size of mobile devices created pressure toward visual simplification—a constraint similar to that faced by hieroglyphic writers working with the limited space of papyrus sheets.

Kurita's original emoji were constrained to a 12x12 pixel grid, necessitating extreme abstraction of visual forms. Even as screen resolutions have improved, this aesthetic of simplification persists, now as a stylistic choice rather than a technical necessity. This

evolution mirrors how hieroglyphic forms initially shaped by carving technology eventually became stylistic conventions in painted forms.

Unicode standardization further shapes emoji development through institutional processes that determine which concepts receive pictorial representation. The Unicode Consortium's decisions about which emoji to approve reflect implicit value judgments about which concepts merit representation. "The seemingly neutral process of emoji standardization," notes Robertson et al. (2018: 3), "is actually deeply political, reflecting the cultural priorities and blind spots of the institutions that control it."

These technological and institutional constraints reveal how emoji, like hieroglyphics, evolve through a complex interplay of communicative needs, technological affordances, and cultural values rather than through simple linear progression.

Universal Language? Not So Fast

One of the most persistent myths about emoji is that they constitute a "universal language" transcending cultural and linguistic boundaries. This claim appears regularly in popular tech journalism despite being thoroughly debunked by research.

Studies by Lu et al. (2016) found substantial cross-cultural variation in emoji usage patterns, with different countries showing distinctive preferences in emoji frequency and category selection. Japanese users, for instance, use emoji at much higher rates than American users and show different preferences in emotion categories.

This cultural embeddedness parallels the culturally specific nature of hieroglyphic symbols, which reflected Egyptian cosmology, religion, and social structure. As Danesi (2016: 24) points out, "Emoji aren't culturally neutral but reflect the specific cultural contexts of their creation and use."

The misconception of emoji as universal reflects what Pennycook (2007) calls "the myth of transparence"—the false assumption that images communicate directly without cultural mediation. This misconception has reinforced problematic claims about emoji as a "regression" to "primitive" pictographic communication. Evans (2017: 21) dismisses such claims as reflecting "not only misunderstanding of emoji's actual function but also problematic assumptions about linguistic evolution that have been thoroughly debunked by contemporary linguistics."

The reality is that emoji, like all communication systems, are deeply embedded in cultural contexts that shape their meaning and use. Far from being a universal language, they reflect and reproduce the cultural assumptions of their creators and users.

Users Subvert the System

Despite institutional control, emoji users consistently repurpose symbols for meanings not intended by their designers. The peach emoji (🍑) rarely refers to fruit; the eggplant (🍆) is

seldom used in cooking contexts. Users create slang, inside jokes, and political symbols from seemingly innocuous pictographs.

This creative repurposing reveals the agency of users within seemingly controlled communication systems. Like graffiti artists reclaiming urban spaces, emoji users appropriate standardized symbols for their own expressive purposes. As de Certeau (1984: xix) argued about everyday practices, users employ tactics that constitute "an art of the weak"—creative adaptations that work within but against dominant systems.

Similar practices appeared in late-period hieroglyphic writing, where evidence suggests increasing creative adaptation of traditional symbols for new contexts (Ritner 1996). In both cases, users find ways to subvert official meanings and create alternative communicative possibilities within constrained systems.

What emerges from examining emoji isn't a direct connection to ancient pictographic systems but rather insights into how visual elements persistently supplement text across vastly different technological contexts. Understanding emoji not as a regression to pictographic writing but as the latest manifestation of enduring patterns in human communication helps us think more clearly about their significance in contemporary digital culture.

Power Dynamics and Cultural Implications of Pictorial Communication

No communication system exists in a political vacuum. Language—whether hieroglyphic, alphabetic, or emoji-enhanced—always reflects and reinforces power structures. Who controls the symbols? Who can use them? Whose experiences get represented? These questions reveal how seemingly innocent pictographs carry significant political weight.

From Scribal Elite to Digital Divide

In Ancient Egypt, hieroglyphic literacy was restricted to an elite minority. Baines (2007: 67) estimates that "less than one percent of the population could read and write hieroglyphics." This wasn't accidental. The complexity of the system helped maintain the privilege of the scribal class and the authority of religious institutions. If you controlled writing, you controlled access to religious texts, legal records, and administrative documents—in other words, you controlled society.

Modern emoji might seem fundamentally different—freely available to anyone with a smartphone. But scratch the surface, and the power dynamics become visible. Stark and Crawford (2015: 8) point out that "access to emoji requires not just basic literacy but specific technological devices, internet connectivity, and digital literacy skills that remain unevenly distributed globally." When half the world's population still lacks internet access, emoji aren't nearly as universal as tech companies like to pretend.

What's fascinating isn't that both systems have access restrictions—all communication systems do—but how these restrictions reflect broader societal inequalities. In ancient Egypt, hieroglyphic literacy reinforced class divisions and religious authority. In our digital age, emoji access reflects global economic disparities and technological divides.

Van Dijk (2020: 32) frames this nicely: "Communication technologies don't create inequality from nothing. They reflect, extend, and sometimes transform existing patterns of social stratification." The specific mechanisms differ dramatically across historical contexts, but communication systems consistently end up mirroring and reinforcing who has power and who doesn't.

Who Controls the Symbols?

In Ancient Egypt, scribal schools enforced orthodox hieroglyphic forms. Innovation wasn't encouraged; significant deviations were treated as errors. Ritner (1996: 73) describes how "standardization of hieroglyphic forms served not only practical communicative purposes but also reinforced scribal authority and cultural continuity." Controlling the symbols helped maintain cultural and religious stability—which coincidentally preserved the power of those who controlled those symbols.

Fast forward to today. Emoji undergo standardization through the Unicode Consortium—an organization dominated by major tech corporations like Apple, Google, Microsoft, and Facebook. These companies decide which concepts receive pictorial representation and how those representations appear. Robertson et al. (2018: 5) observe that "decision-making power over which concepts receive emoji representation rests primarily with corporate entities whose commercial interests may not align with those of diverse user communities."

You want a hijab emoji? A gender-neutral person? A taco? All had to be approved by committee, with corporate interests influencing which symbols were prioritized. As Highfield and Leaver (2016: 50) note, "The process of deciding which cultural concepts merit pictorial representation inevitably privileges certain experiences while marginalizing others."

The parallels here aren't in claiming equivalent power structures but in recognizing how control over symbols intersects with broader social hierarchies. Bourdieu (1991: 37) wasn't thinking about emoji when he wrote that "symbolic systems are not merely instruments of knowledge but also instruments of domination," but he might as well have been.

What Gets Pictured? What Gets Erased?

Communication systems inevitably reflect the cultural priorities and blind spots of their creators. Ancient Egyptian hieroglyphics prominently featured symbols related to the Nile valley environment, religious concepts, and social hierarchies central to Egyptian civilization. Hornung (1992: 17) points out that "the hieroglyphic sign inventory reflected a distinctly Egyptian worldview and cosmic understanding." You wouldn't find symbols for polar bears or pine trees, but you'd find plenty for papyrus, falcons, and royal regalia.

Similarly, the early emoji lexicon reflected distinctly Japanese cultural concepts—specific foods, customs, and symbols that made perfect sense to Japanese users but confused Westerners when emoji went global. Even after Unicode's diversity efforts, studies by Barbieri and Camacho-Collados (2018) found persistent Western and technological biases in emoji representation.

I've watched with interest as Unicode has gradually expanded the emoji lexicon to include more diverse skin tones, religious symbols, and cultural references. But these additions always come after sustained public pressure, revealing how the default assumes a particular user (typically Western, typically tech-savvy, typically middle-class).

Nakamura (2002: 5) captures this dynamic perfectly in her analysis of digital iconography: "Visual representations are never neutral but always embedded within specific cultural narratives and power structures." The symbols we create inevitably center some experiences while marginalizing others.

Users Fight Back

Despite institutional control, users of both communication systems find ways to subvert official meanings and create alternative possibilities. In late-period hieroglyphic writing, we see increasing creative adaptation of traditional symbols for new contexts (Ritner 1996). Similarly, emoji users frequently repurpose symbols for meanings not intended by their designers—from sexual innuendo to political protest.

The peach emoji (🍑) almost never refers to actual fruit. The folded hands (🙏) intended to represent prayer get used to mean "please" or "thank you." The upside-down face (🙃) has evolved to signal passive aggression. Users take standardized symbols and create their own meanings, building community-specific slang that institutional authorities never anticipated.

De Certeau (1984: xix) wasn't thinking about emoji when he described how users employ tactics that constitute "an art of the weak"—creative adaptations that work within but against dominant systems—but his analysis applies perfectly. Users find ways to reclaim agency within seemingly controlled communication systems.

This tension between institutional control and user innovation appears consistently across communication systems despite their vast historical and technological differences. As Castells (2009: 53) argues, "Communication power lies in both the institutional capacity to impose meanings and the creative capacity of users to generate alternative interpretations."

The Aesthetics of Communication

Both hieroglyphics and emoji blur boundaries between utilitarian communication and aesthetic expression. Hieroglyphic inscriptions weren't just functional but deliberately aesthetic, with scribes taking pride in the artistic execution of their texts. Baines (2012: 28) notes that "the aesthetic dimension of hieroglyphic writing wasn't incidental but central to its cultural function and prestige."

Similarly, emoji arrangements often display aesthetic patterns that exceed purely communicative needs. Users create visually pleasing sequences, balance colors, and consider the overall visual impact of their messages. Gawne and McCulloch (2019: 7) observe that "emoji sequences often display aesthetic patterns that exceed utilitarian communicative needs."

This aesthetic dimension transforms communication from mere information transfer into cultural practice. The ability to create elegant hieroglyphic inscriptions or clever emoji combinations becomes what Bourdieu (1984) called "cultural capital"—knowledge that signals social position and taste.

I've noticed this in my own research. Skilled emoji users don't just slap random pictographs into their messages; they consider placement, rhythm, and visual flow. There's an art to it—an unspoken set of aesthetic principles that separate the novice from the expert. Just as ancient scribes gained status through beautiful hieroglyphic execution, today's digital natives gain social currency through sophisticated emoji usage.

Stark and Crawford (2015: 10) frame this nicely: "Emoji competence represents a form of digital cultural capital that signals belonging within particular online communities." The stakes might seem lower than in ancient religious inscriptions, but the social dynamics are surprisingly similar—communication becomes a site where technical skill, cultural knowledge, and aesthetic judgment intersect.

Beyond Simple Binaries

What emerges from examining hieroglyphics and emoji through the lens of power dynamics isn't a simplistic equation between these systems but rather insights into how pictorial communication consistently functions as a site where access, control, representation, and resistance intersect.

The specific power dynamics differ dramatically across historical contexts, but communication systems consistently reflect broader social hierarchies while also creating spaces for resistance and innovation. As Kress and van Leeuwen (2001: 67) argue, "The visual dimension of communication has always been a site where functional, aesthetic, and social dimensions intertwine."

Understanding these patterns helps us move beyond both technologically deterministic views that treat communication systems as neutral tools and simplistic evolutionary narratives that portray pictorial elements as primitive precursors to "real" writing. Both hieroglyphics and emoji reveal how visual communication always exists within specific power structures that shape who can communicate, how they can communicate, and whose experiences get represented.

In our rush to either dismiss emoji as trivial or praise them as universal language, we've missed the opportunity to examine how they reflect and sometimes challenge existing power dynamics. Just as hieroglyphics weren't merely neutral carriers of information but complex social artifacts embedded in religious and political structures, emoji aren't just cute pictures

but visual elements that reflect corporate priorities, cultural assumptions, and user resistance.

I've tried to avoid both alarmism and utopianism in this analysis. Emoji aren't destroying language, as some linguistic conservatives fear. Nor are they creating a perfect universal communication system, as some tech enthusiasts claim. They're the latest manifestation of our complex relationship with visual communication—a relationship always shaped by who has power and who doesn't.

What we can learn from comparing these systems isn't that history repeats itself, but that certain patterns in how visual communication intersects with social power persist despite vastly different technological contexts. Recognizing these patterns helps us understand emoji not as unprecedented digital novelties but as part of humanity's ongoing negotiation with visual representation and its relationship to power.

Conclusion

So where does this comparative analysis leave us? Let me be clear one final time: emoji aren't "digital hieroglyphics." They serve different functions, operate through different mechanisms, and exist within entirely different linguistic and technological contexts. Anyone who claims direct equivalence either doesn't understand hieroglyphics, doesn't understand emoji, or is being deliberately obtuse for clicks.

But dismissing any comparison whatsoever means missing something important about how humans communicate. The patterns that emerge from this analysis suggest that our relationship with visual elements in writing is more complex and persistent than traditional models of writing system evolution acknowledge.

Both hieroglyphics and emoji demonstrate how visual elements enhance the emotional and contextual dimensions of text, compress complex meaning into efficient forms, and blur boundaries between writing and aesthetic expression. These functional similarities exist not because of historical connection but because both systems respond to enduring challenges in human communication that manifest differently across technological contexts.

The social dimensions are equally revealing. Both systems reflect how pictorial communication inevitably intersects with power structures—who controls the symbols, who can access them, and whose experiences they represent. From scribal authority to corporate standardization, from religious hierarchy to digital divide, communication systems consistently reflect broader social inequalities while also creating spaces for resistance and innovation.

Perhaps the most significant insight is how both systems challenge linear narratives about writing system evolution. The conventional wisdom portrays pictographic elements as developmental stages to be transcended on the path toward purely phonetic writing. But hieroglyphics maintained visual representation as a core feature for three millennia, while emoji reintroduce pictorial elements into digital communication despite our supposedly "advanced" alphabetic systems.

This pattern suggests that the integration of visual elements into writing isn't a developmental stage but a persistent human tendency that manifests across diverse technological contexts. Our resistance to letting written words become too detached from visual representation appears to be a feature of human communication, not a bug.

I started this research irritated by both the facile equation of emoji with hieroglyphics in popular tech journalism and the dismissive attitude toward emoji in much linguistic scholarship. What I found was more nuanced and, I think, more interesting—patterns in how humans integrate visual and verbal elements that transcend specific historical moments and technological contexts.

There are obvious limitations to this comparative approach. The historical record of hieroglyphic usage is necessarily incomplete, particularly regarding informal communication that might have more direct parallels to everyday emoji use. And the vast technological, cultural, and functional differences between these systems make direct comparisons problematic.

But stepping back from direct comparison to look at broader patterns has value. It helps us understand emoji not as unprecedented digital novelties but as the latest manifestation of our complex relationship with visual communication—a relationship that has evolved across technologies and cultures while maintaining certain persistent features.

In the end, emoji don't represent a "return" to hieroglyphics any more than modern poetry represents a "return" to ancient epics. What they do represent is our stubborn, glorious insistence on finding ways to make our written words carry not just our thoughts but our emotions, our tone, our presence. That persistence—the human behind the symbols—is what connects these vastly different systems across the millennia.

Academic Outlook

This comparative analysis opens several research paths that might yield further insights into pictorial elements in communication systems. I've been thinking about where this work could go next, and a few directions seem particularly promising.

Better Methods for Cross-Historical Comparison

One obvious challenge in this research has been developing rigorous methods for comparing communication systems across vastly different historical contexts without falling into anachronism or false equivalence. Huhtamo and Parikka (2011: 13) highlight this problem in media archaeology, noting the difficulty of "identifying recurrent semiotic patterns without imposing anachronistic frameworks."

I've tried to address this by focusing on functional parallels rather than direct historical connections, but this approach could benefit from more formal methodological development. A taxonomy of pictorial functions across communication systems could help identify specific

categories—emotional markers, determinatives, identity signals—that manifest across diverse systems without claiming direct historical relationships.

This taxonomy could serve as a framework for more precise comparative analysis while respecting historical specificity. For example, emoji functioning as tone markers could be compared with determinatives in hieroglyphics not as historically connected phenomena but as functionally similar responses to the limitations of written communication.

Computational approaches also hold promise here. While hieroglyphic corpora are obviously limited compared to the vast digital traces of emoji usage, computational methods could still yield insights into patterns of pictorial distribution, combination, and evolution. Some fascinating work by Gawne and McCulloch (2019: 12) suggests that "computational methods offer powerful tools for identifying semiotic patterns across disparate communication systems." I'd love to see these methods applied more systematically to the question of pictorial persistence.

The Neuroscience of Pictorial Processing

Another intriguing direction involves the cognitive processing of pictorial elements in text. Some preliminary studies by Cohn et al. (2016) indicate that emoji activate visual processing regions differently than purely textual content, suggesting distinct neural pathways for pictorial elements in communication.

We obviously can't put ancient Egyptians in fMRI machines to study hieroglyphic processing, but experimental studies using unfamiliar pictographic systems with contemporary subjects could provide insights into the cognitive processing of complex pictorial-textual systems. Dehaene's (2009: 174) work on reading neuroscience notes "the brain's reading circuits reveal remarkable plasticity in adapting to diverse writing systems," suggesting that similar neural mechanisms might underlie the processing of pictorial elements across different systems.

Such research could help explain why pictorial elements persistently recur in communication systems despite their apparent inefficiency compared to purely alphabetic systems. If pictorial elements activate distinct emotional or memory pathways, this could provide a neurocognitive explanation for their persistence across technological contexts.

I've found myself wondering: do emoji succeed because they tap into neural pathways that evolved for facial recognition and emotional processing? Does the brain process the crying-laughing emoji (😂) more like an actual human face than like the words "that's hilarious"? These questions deserve empirical investigation.

Beyond Emoji: Digital Pictography's Expanding Universe

While I've focused specifically on emoji in this analysis, future research should examine other forms of digital pictography that further illuminate patterns of pictorial persistence.

These include stickers, GIFs, memes, reaction images, and other visual formats that supplement text-based digital interaction.

Miltner and Highfield (2017: 3) have started this work, observing that "digital communication has spawned multiple pictorial formats that serve distinct but overlapping communicative functions." The proliferation of these formats suggests that emoji represent just one manifestation of a broader digital turn toward visual communication.

I'm particularly interested in how different pictorial formats occupy distinct functional niches within digital communication. Stickers offer more complex emotional expressions than emoji but require more effort to select. GIFs add motion to convey complex reactions but take longer to load. Memes combine image and text in ways that create intertextual meaning across communities. Comparing how these formats function could refine our understanding of how technological affordances shape pictorial communication in digital contexts.

Practical Implications for Design and Policy

This research has practical implications that extend beyond academic interest. Understanding emoji as manifestations of persistent human communicative needs rather than mere technological novelties could inform more thoughtful approaches to their governance and development.

The current Unicode standardization process reflects a limited understanding of pictorial communication's cultural dimensions. As Robertson et al. (2018: 8) argue, "Unicode's approach to emoji standardization reflects institutional biases that systematically privilege certain cultural perspectives." Research examining alternative governance models could help address these biases and create more representative pictorial systems.

Similarly, communication platform designers could benefit from understanding emoji not as cute decorations but as manifestations of persistent human needs for emotional and contextual marking in text. This perspective could inform design approaches that better integrate pictorial and textual elements in digital interfaces.

I've noticed that most messaging platforms still treat emoji as afterthoughts—tacked-on features rather than core communicative elements. What would a messaging system designed from the ground up to integrate visual and verbal elements look like? How might we design interfaces that acknowledge the fundamental role of pictorial elements in digital communication?

Final Thoughts

The study of pictorial elements in communication systems sits at a productive intersection of linguistics, media studies, cognitive science, and digital humanities. By moving beyond both dismissive attitudes toward emoji and overstated claims about their connection to ancient writing systems, we can develop more nuanced frameworks for understanding the persistent human tendency to integrate visual and verbal expression.

This research area would benefit from interdisciplinary collaboration—bringing together linguists, archaeologists, cognitive scientists, and digital communication researchers to examine pictorial persistence across diverse contexts. Only through such collaboration can we hope to understand not just specific communication systems but the enduring patterns in human expression that transcend them.

As someone who began this research skeptical of claims about emoji's significance, I've come to see them as a fascinating window into enduring aspects of human communication. They're not revolutionizing language, as tech evangelists claim, nor destroying it, as curmudgeons fear. They're simply the latest manifestation of our persistent desire to make our written words carry more than just abstract meaning—to make them speak with our full human voice.

References

Allen, J. P. (2014) *Middle Egyptian: An Introduction to the Language and Culture of Hieroglyphs*, 3rd ed. Cambridge University Press

Androutsopoulos, J. (2011) From variation to heteroglossia in the study of computer-mediated discourse. In C. Thurlow & K. Mroczek (eds.), *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*, 277-298. Oxford University Press

Baines, J. (2007) *Visual and written culture in ancient Egypt*. Oxford University Press

Baines, J. (2012) The earliest Egyptian writing: Development, context, purpose. In S. D. Houston (ed.), *The First Writing: Script Invention as History and Process*, 150-189. Cambridge University Press

Barbieri, F. and Camacho-Collados, J. (2018) How gender and skin tone modifiers affect emoji semantics in Twitter. In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, 101-106

Barthes, R. (1977) *Image-Music-Text*. Fontana

Blagdon, J. (2013) How emoji conquered the world. *The Verge*, 4 March. Available at: https://www.theverge.com/2013/3/4/3966140/how-emoji-conquered-the-world (Accessed: 10 March 2025)

Bolter, J. D. and Grusin, R. (2000) *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. MIT Press

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Harvard University Press

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press

Castells, M. (2009) *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press

Cohn, N., Engelen, J. and Schilperoord, J. (2016) The visual language of comics. In F. Parrill, V. Tobin & M. Turner (eds.), *Meaning, Form, and Body*, 77-91. CSLI Publications

Danesi, M. (2016) *The Semiotics of Emoji: The Rise of Visual Language in the Age of the Internet*. Bloomsbury Academic

de Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press

Dehaene, S. (2009) *Reading in the Brain: The New Science of How We Read*. Penguin

Derrida, J. (1976) *Of Grammatology*. Johns Hopkins University Press

Dresner, E. and Herring, S. C. (2010) Functions of the nonverbal in CMC: Emoticons and illocutionary force. *Communication Theory* 20(3): 249-268

Eco, U. (1976) *A Theory of Semiotics*. Indiana University Press

Evans, V. (2017) *The Emoji Code: The Linguistics Behind Smiley Faces and Scaredy Cats*. Picador

Gawne, L. and McCulloch, G. (2019) Emoji as digital gestures. *Language@Internet* 17: 1-29

Gelb, I. J. (1952) *A Study of Writing*. University of Chicago Press

Goldwasser, O. (1995) *From Icon to Metaphor: Studies in the Semiotics of the Hieroglyphs*. University Press

Herring, S. C. and Dainas, A. R. (2017) "Nice picture comment!" Graphicons in Facebook comment threads. In *Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 2185-2194

Highfield, T. and Leaver, T. (2016) Instagrammatics and digital methods: Studying visual social media, from selfies and GIFs to memes and emoji. *Communication Research and Practice* 2(1): 47-62

Hornung, E. (1992) *Idea into Image: Essays on Ancient Egyptian Thought*. Timken

Huhtamo, E. and Parikka, J. (eds.) (2011) *Media Archaeology: Approaches, Applications, and Implications*. University of California Press

Jakobson, R. (1960) Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, 350-377. MIT Press

Kress, G. and van Leeuwen, T. (2001) *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. Arnold

Loprieno, A. (1995) *Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction*. Cambridge University Press

Lu, X., Ai, W., Liu, X., Li, Q., Wang, N., Huang, G. and Mei, Q. (2016) Learning from the ubiquitous language: An empirical analysis of emoji usage of smartphone users. In

Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, 770-780

Malafouris, L. (2013) *How Things Shape the Mind: A Theory of Material Engagement*. MIT Press

McCulloch, G. (2019) *Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language*. Riverhead Books

McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill

Miltner, K. M. and Highfield, T. (2017) Never gonna GIF you up: Analyzing the cultural significance of the animated GIF. *Social Media + Society* 3(3): 1-11

Mitchell, W. J. T. (1994) *Picture Theory: Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*. University of Chicago Press

Moschini, I. (2017) The "face with tears of joy" emoji: A socio-semiotic and multimodal insight into a Japan-America mash-up. *HERMES-Journal of Language and Communication in Business* 55: 11-25

Nakamura, L. (2002) *Cybertypes: Race, Ethnicity, and Identity on the Internet*. Routledge

Pennycook, A. (2007) *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. Routledge

Postman, N. (1985) *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. Viking

Ritner, R. K. (1996) Egyptian writing. In P. T. Daniels & W. Bright (eds.), *The World's Writing Systems*, 73-84. Oxford University Press

Robertson, A., Magdy, W. and Goldwater, S. (2018) Self-representation on Twitter using emoji skin color modifiers. In *Proceedings of the 12th International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 680-683

Robinson, A. (2009) *Writing and Script: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press

Schmandt-Besserat, D. (1992) *Before Writing, Vol. I: From Counting to Cuneiform*. University of Texas Press

Stark, L. and Crawford, K. (2015) The conservatism of emoji: Work, affect, and communication. *Social Media + Society* 1(2): 1-11

Unicode (2023) *Full Emoji List, v15.0*. Available at: https://unicode.org/emoji/charts/full-emoji-list.html (Accessed: 15 March 2025)

van Dijk, J. (2020) *The Digital Divide*. Polity Press

Walther, J. B. and D'Addario, K. P. (2001) The impacts of emoticons on message interpretation in computer-mediated communication. *Social Science Computer Review* 19(3): 324-347