INOSR HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES 12(1): 1-6, 2026. ISSN: 2705-1684

 INOSRHSS121.0000

International Network Organization for Scientific Research
https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRHSS/2026/121.16000

Neuroaesthetics: The Scope and Limits of Neuroscience in Explaining Art and Aesthetic Experience

Kakungulu Samuel J.

Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda

ABSTRACT

Neuroaesthetics has emerged as an interdisciplinary field that examines the neural foundations of artistic creation, perception, and aesthetic judgment. By applying neuroscientific methods such as EEG, fMRI, and PET, the field seeks to explain how the brain processes beauty, emotion, meaning, and artistic experience. This study explores both the scope and the limitations of neuroscience in explaining art and aesthetic experience. It demonstrates that neuroaesthetics has significantly advanced understanding of perceptual, emotional, and cognitive mechanisms involved in encounters with visual art, music, literature, and performance. Concepts such as reward systems, mirror neurons, embodied cognition, and affective processing provide valuable insights into why certain artistic experiences evoke pleasure, emotional resonance, and engagement. However, the paper argues that neuroscience alone cannot fully account for the complexity of art. Contextual interpretation, cultural mediation, historical conditions, symbolism, narrative meaning, and individual subjectivity exceed purely neural explanations. Aesthetic value is shaped not only by brain activity but also by social experience, education, memory, and cultural frameworks. Methodological limitations in neuroimaging, inferential risks, and issues of ecological validity further restrict the explanatory power of current neuroscientific models. The study therefore emphasizes the importance of interdisciplinary integration between neuroscience, philosophy, anthropology, psychology, art history, and cultural studies. By critically assessing representative debates in visual arts, music, and literary performance, the paper concludes that neuroaesthetics should be understood not as a reductionist replacement for traditional aesthetics, but as a complementary framework that enriches broader discussions about art, meaning, creativity, and human experience.

Keywords: Neuroaesthetics, Aesthetic Experience, Neuroscience and Art, Embodied Cognition and Cultural Interpretation.

INTRODUCTION

Neuroaesthetics is often prematurely dismissed as a reductionist endeavor that aims to explain artistic meaning or value solely through the identification of particular brain circuits [1]. Such a view disregards the significant empirical evidence indicating that, while neural activity alone cannot account for the full range of art-related questions, it can nevertheless elucidate what one actually perceives and experiences when confronted with a work of art, as well as the associated emotional responses[2]. Given that these aspects are crucial to the understanding of art, as evidenced by a long-standing philosophical tradition [1]. Neuroscience can illuminate the modalities through which artistic messages and the meanings of artworks are conveyed, even if the specific contents of such messages remain largely exploratory [2]. The vast diversity of artworks does indeed give rise to highly complex questions concerning their meanings and the interpretations exhibited by different individuals; yet, there also exist general principles in terms of which the activation of art-related circuits and the production of feelings of aesthetic pleasure may be explained [3]. Neuroaesthetics has already contributed to the examination of such principles, in conjunction with their implications for art theory, aesthetic philosophy, philosophy of language, and the sociology

of education. Art is a prominent catalyst for many of the emotions that engage humankind. Art and the sciences thus have much to say to one another in this broad domain [3].

Foundations of Neuroaesthetics

The notion of neuroaesthetics has been popular since the beginning of the 21st century, and can be defined as the attempt to ground aesthetic experience, even artwork appreciation in neurocognitive data [4]. Neuroaesthetics benefits from an array of concepts and discoveries in basic neuroscience, such as the care and consideration of affect, consciousness and the brain, attentional system dynamics, reward system dynamics, mirror neuron circuits, the dynamic-prediction-action-Perception processing loop, and others [5]. Classical neuroscience could also be profitably addressed to the reasoned understandings of popular, art-branded elements, such as beauty, imitation, or the conspicuous absence of art [1] , categories that could still feature in non-neurocognitive artistic planning even in a neural-dominated art. Neuroaesthetics could as well reasonably clash with psycho-phenomenology, extended mind, intersubjectivity, and art as pretext, corollary or (secondary) symptom. Arguably, all such aspects either pinpoint patently extraneous elements relative to the general neuro-aesthetic doctrine, or alternatively attach to extreme and hesitant versions for which the term 'art' could be problematic [6]. Art may be neurobiological, yet there may be the need of a clear distinction between 'art' and its neurobiological levels, including awareness of the relative autonomy of the latter [7].

What Neuroaesthetics Cannot Explain or Currently Struggles With

Neuroaesthetics cannot account for certain dimensions of art and aesthetic experience that are at odds with the correlational, universalizing, and cerebral assumptions underpinning the field. Four areas currently challenge the explanatory scope of neuroaesthetics: [1] the contextual and cultural mediation of aesthetic value; [2] complex interpretation, narrative, and meaning; [3] individual difference, phenomenology, and subjectivity; and [4] the temporal dynamics and processuality of aesthetic appraisal. Contextual expectations affect aesthetic appreciation: labeling artworks as computer-generated reduces activity in the medial orbitofrontal and prefrontal cortices [1]. Such frameworks draw on art-critical, philosophical, literary, and theoretical knowledge yet remain neglected by neuroaesthetics. Attention models, including Ockhamist and cognitive theories, seek general laws of perception yet confirm the stimulation of contextual information [2]. Neuroaesthetics therefore enters the realm of complex interpretation, narrative, and meaning across metaphorical, symbolical, political, philosophy, and other dimensions that transcend direct content and value [2]. Aesthetic experience varies markedly according to individual and biographical differences in bodily, emotional, and experiential aspects. Órbita and Objects provide art-learning experiences based on cognitive and emotional engagement grounded in contextual historical information and personal attitudes reiterated through autoethnographic accounts, bracketing the artwork [4]. Neuroaesthetics overlooks this fundamental semiotic relationship between artwork and subject, further hampered by its restriction to static brain-images captured while viewing or performing art. For neuroaesthetics, interpretation remains confined to the decoding of configuration, structure, and organization [7].

Contextual and Cultural Mediation of Aesthetic Value

Aesthetic value is mediated by cultural and contextual frames at multiple scales, ranging from everyday experiences of objects and situations to the determinants of taste that mark social class or ostentiation [1]. Aesthetic judgment is therefore rarely a straightforward response to the artwork itself within hermetically defined art worlds, free of mediations [2]. Contextual information is so relevant that the same object may be treated as an art object in one situation and as a mere thing or everyday object in another [3]. Mediation and negotiation apply not just to contextual information but also to wide-ranging historically contingent cultural factors and interests, determining which objects, events, or practices are deemed worthy of becoming artistic, aesthetic, or "high art" in the first place[4].

Complex Interpretation, Meaning, and Narrative

Neuroaesthetics investigates brain functions associated with artworks. Brain imaging is linked to emotional and cognitive response patterns that generate aesthetic appreciation, including the involvement of the perceptual system in the formation of aesthetic experience [5]. Understanding artwork cognition, the difference between art and non-art stimuli perception, and the neural basis for the apprehension of originals versus non-originals is essential for defining art, yet understanding complex interpretation from various modalities, temporal dynamics, cultural mediation, and individual differences cannot be completely elucidated by neuroscience alone [6, 7].

Individual Difference and Phenomenology

Neuroaesthetics applies neuroscientific methods such as EEG, fMRI, and PET to study the role of the brain in aesthetic processes, including creation, reception, and judgment of art [3]. It explores universal laws of art and address questions about shared aesthetic experiences, their relationship with everyday life, and the influence of individual differences [4]. The field relates to the mind-body problem, considering whether mental processes can be fully explained by natural sciences. Some neurophilosophers believe this problem is solvable, aiming to replace psychological descriptions with neuroscientific terminology, while others reject reductionism but acknowledge the

challenges in understanding subjective experiences through biological processes [2]. It is difficult to follow the argument that the observations of sharing neural substrates substantiate the significance of symmetry and complexity for our judgment of beauty. Long-term musical education makes us more sensitive to the detection of negative emotions like sadness in music or speech [3]. Pictures with a strong emotional appeal more often show their optical center on the left side, corresponding to the right hemisphere in neural processing. Most studies focus on the neural underpinnings of sensational, emotional, or semantic aspects of experiences with visual art. Neuroimaging studies raise basic questions: what is art, how does the brain process art compared to non-art, and what neural differences exist between viewing original artworks, copies, or non-art images [3].

Temporal Dynamics and Processual Aspects of Aesthetic Judgment

Aesthetic judgment derives from an aesthetic attitude or stance, innate and cultivated constructs that evolve over a lifetime through formal and informal education [3]. This reflexive mechanism establishes a constantly updating database of sensed objects and cues, a functioning dual-input system combining innate knowledge with cultural acquisition and interpretation [4]. The awareness, association, and consideration of references intimately associated with an object precede the evolution of a personal attitude, indexed by a first internal decision. This temporal position constitutes, notwithstanding the rapidity of the action, a formative act of aesthetic judgment, even when further influences lead to systematic elaborations [3]. An attended object either possesses sufficient salience, resulting in entry into the cognitive field, or remains excluded, thereby refraining from resolution in either an aesthetic or conceptual direction. Neural mechanisms participate in retranscription: motor control of the eye and extramotor mechanisms of protention [1].

Methodological Considerations and Epistemic Limits

Neuroscience, and the various disciplines studying the mind-brain relationship, developed techniques and theories capable of elucidating the role of the nervous system in making art, receiving art, and thinking about art [1]. Theoretical frameworks arise from the cognitive sciences that not only clarify the precise intellectual activities involved in aesthetic choices and sensuous appreciation, but also test the validity of aesthetic criteria. Aesthetic observations can be induced experimentally under laboratory conditions and measured through instrumental and computational techniques [2]. Instruments have been devised to assess properties of works of art, musical compositions, and artistic performances that contribute to aesthetic pleasure and satisfaction and, at the same time, to investigate individual and social differences in aesthetic appreciation. Cognitive frameworks and investigations can be applied to artistic creativity in native and exotic work forms [3]. The aim is to help construct a scientifically grounded theory of art that could serve both as a general typology of the main forms of art and as a psychologically, cognitively, and socially plausible characterization of a specific form of art, served by different media and styles but still considered as belonging to the same type. Explanatory, controlling, and predictive regularities characterizing the creation, appreciation, and thought processes about art works are expected to emerge from these first endeavours[3]. Although the scientific study of aesthetic experience has a long-standing tradition, theoretical work on the neural correlates of aesthetic experience still remains scarce, especially in a neurophilosophical perspective. Cognitive science, broadly speaking, ignores aesthetic experience, despite a resurgence of theories inspired by the cognitive sciences and a flourishing of experimental studies backed by philosophical reflections about other aspects of the mind and art[3]. Attempts at integrating these philosophies into the question of art and the brain remain rudimentary, unlike the extensive historical dialogue, theoretical confrontation, and experimental collaboration established with phenomenology and the philosophy of the mind. To the farthest extent possible, therefore, it appears desirable to build a preliminary yet serious bridge between the study of aesthetics and the growing field of empirical studies in neuroscience, particularly devoted to aesthetics and the creative process [4]. This programme would enable testing the validity of long-standing philosophical accounts by mapping their major tenets onto neurophysiological and cognitive criteria, hence advancing on the first premises already proposed that could potentially render those accounts scientifically tractable [1].

Measurement Challenges in Neuroimaging and Behavior

Numerous attempts to identify a neural correlate of beauty have been conducted since the mid-19th century. These attempts employed various measurement techniques, including self-report, behavioral rating, psychophysics, eye tracking, and neuroimaging [5]. The resulting findings shed light on what constitutes beauty in art and the design principles behind it. Such research can be categorized into three broad families of stimuli, visual, auditory, and literary, within which a mechanistic understanding of beauty is pursued at multiple abstraction levels [6]. The aesthetic domains of these families are distinct yet fundamentally related, indicating that the correspondence between an artwork's physical properties and its aesthetic appreciation operates according to common principles across art forms [4]. In contrast to beauty, neither any neurological nor psychological principle, let alone theory, underpins the idea that a piece of art brings, expresses, or embodies meaning. Indeed, an enduring debate continues as to what meaning precisely is. The absence of a shared object of investigation hampers the general, meaningful formulation of an abstraction related to artistic and aesthetic meaning similar to those sought for

beauty [5]. Consequently, an exploration of meaning in art and aesthetics must therefore refrain from invoking this concept, however relevant it may otherwise appear [3].

Inferential Risks and Ecological Validity

The maximal findings about aesthetic experience that neuroscientific studies may deliver are limited to materials or agents liable to convey a pervasively shared aesthetic engagement, which may partly or at most be captured with highly abstract neural indicators [3]. Extension of findings experimentally derived from formalized aesthetic forms (mostly well-understood and excluded in core experimental disciplines) to substances conventionally regarded as aesthetic (mostly constituting of flood of traces in brain imaging and perceived by the general audience as art) is implausible, basic physical-filter-level acoustic or semantico-artificial-abstract-typographic features substantially separating most literary art, such as poetry, from mere language, along with widespread scarcity of retrieval and retention of prefixed stimuli-content information, reveal that probing of any such discipline is unlikely to yield an informative transdisciplinary course of investigation[4]. Formal and prepausal structure of universally regarded musical 'art' recordings, built partly or partially chiefly upon and within iconic-abstract contours construed to 'evoke' emotionally solidly anchored-noted world-experience-etc. iconisms bordering art/music separation, deployed in rhythmic patterns typically re-performed and markable by 'speech-prosodic' like time, further indicate either 'semantic' or 'situated' auctorial-stylistic-mostly–abstract (ambient/background) discourse condition essential to any formal-reaching address[5]. The scarce theoretical reports establishing, let alone explicating, an aurally-stilled-figure-to-core-thumbnail-output-transmission pseudo-address vis-à-vis full-length first-schema-event rendition at one semantic pole, compound the transdisciplinary-course unplausibility in viewing music as art [6].

Interdisciplinary Integration with Philosophy, Anthropology, and Art History

Neuroscience grew rapidly since the nineteenth century. At the turn of the twenty-first century, the staggering accumulation of knowledge raised new interest in re-evaluating old topics, including the meaning of art and the nature of aesthetic experience, from a neurobiological perspective [3]. On-going research has confirmed, extended, and systematized what aesthetic theorists have long known: behaviour, experience, and commentary about works of art and the (non-artistic) objects of aesthetic appreciation connect across a wide range of individuals, societies, and historical epochs [4]. Experiencing aesthetics proffers value-going mappings and accompanies subjective feeling-attitudes supporting further exploration of events, entities, and situations of personal interest, drawing the beholder back into ordinary life-experience. Despite accumulating empirical knowledge, conclusive evidence about the nature and origins of the experience from neurobiological research remains elusive [5]. Some philosophers assert that the challenge of art's meaning can be met by seeking physical aspects of works of art that co-vary with human commentary and behaviour. This premise is too broad because it begs the question of which physical aspects to investigate and why, while also collapsing into mere measurement of the artifact [6]. Even if neurobiological research were to elaborate a comprehensive method for ranking any such physical aspect of any artefact, it would still fail to engage the socio-historically embedded nature of commentary concerning any given set of co-varying events since art and art appreciators remain subject to social influences and negotiations. Art theory continues to grapple with embodiment and experience, aesthetics pervades artistic practice, and questions addressed by the arts, despite the harrowing loss of safe engagement with publicly valued meanings in many regions, retain vital importance to individual authors, animals still do not appreciate any artefact produced by non-human artists, and a plethora of other theoretically probing, solution-gathering, and interrogative questions about art remain open for further discourse [1,7].

Case Studies and Representative Debates

Neuroaesthetics applies neuroscientific methods (e.g., EEG, fMRI, PET) to elucidate mental processes involved in creating and experiencing art, focusing on the brain's role in aesthetic decisions, pleasures derived from different mediums, and links between aesthetic and quotidian encounters[3]. It pursues universal laws of art by investigating brain-mind relationships, thereby underscoring the mind-body problem. Some neurophilosophers contend that neuroscientific accounts can resolve this quandary; others, like Metzinger and Pauen, reject such reductionist strategies [1]. While neuroaesthetics discernedly advances knowledge of aesthetic experience, scrutiny of specific debates reveals theoretical limits inherent in current data and methodological approaches. Three pivotal inquiries exemplify the associations, interactions, and complex parameters surrounding art and aesthetics [4]. Engaging visual arts and the notion of beauty, the first question probes whether beauty constitutes a crucial parameter in aesthetic and artistic value or is an overt phenomenon susceptible to rational-scientific examination. The second, focusing on music, examines the intertwined themes of embodiment, emotion, and meaning, questioning whether music signifies an autonomous dimension of artistic expression divorced from extra-musical semiosis. Finally, the third addresses literature and performance by exploring the processes underlying aesthetic judgment and their relevance to understanding art [5, 6].

Visual Arts and Beauty

Art, particularly the visual arts, has long been associated with beauty. Works of art, whether music, paintings, literature, or others, can obviously be beautiful, yet only visual art is predominantly linked to aesthetic experience, emerging from norms, regulations and knowledge of figurative representation [4]. In the visualization and painting domain, citizens perceive beauty in those images that others produce. The scientific study of beauty initially occurred in the fields of mathematics and music, with the second law of thermodynamics and inverse square law regarded as classical beauty prototypes [5]. Visual beauty is still studied within mathematics and physics, yet the scope of beauty may become narrow to modern science [5]; while reasonable and based on observations, artists have visual beauties that transcend these beauty prototypes defined by science. For a painter expressing the artistic-thoughts beauty of a landscape may be an expected task [6]. The collection of figures that the painter can conceive to trouble and complicate the masterpieces is enormous. Surprisingly, a painter preparing paintings needs no understanding of the literal meaning of the symbols piano and its music before land forming their artistic-thoughts [3]. Science and modelling art attract many scientists' interests the physical and emergent properties and intrinsic beauty captured became representations of different kinds of symbolic art may have received certain naked beauty art from the origin and mastered procedures guiding artists perform and visualize additional elements beyond the corresponding naked art [3].

Music and Embodiment

Music is arguably the art form that best exemplifies the centrality of embodied experiences in aesthetic appreciation [2]. Even to the casual observer, listening to music often goes hand in hand with swaying, tapping, facial contortions, and even singing. Music drives bodily motion and, often, various forms of mimetic expression, projected onto the body of the listener [6]. The body itself is a musical instrument [7]. Within the framework of embodied cognition, the role of the body in auditory processing might help to elucidate both how sounds are perceived and, by analogy, how behavioural input can be mapped onto images and other nonself-expressive forms of art. Art informs on more than the content projected onto it; it sheds light on the embodied practices engaged in its production and on the modality through which it is expressed [7].

Literary and Performative Arts

Articulating a narrative compellingly and coherently is essential, regardless of the medium involved. Yet literature and performance arts present distinctive challenges of their own [4]. Both challenge the synchronisation of sensory and neural coupling since they unfold over time and divert attention from the medium to the unfolding meaning throughout its duration. Furthermore, literary texts and performances are actively produced in an encounter as performers concede the lead in interpretable agency to the audience and the same applies with authors and texts from an author to a reader [5]. The interplay and the frames thereby introduced pose extremely deep challenges for aesthetic approaches of all kinds and even more so when behavioural measures are required. Of the many components of key dynamics in literature and performance art [2] , three core aspects serve to distinguish these media from visual and music modalities; language, stage, and presence, each of which engage the generic coupling of inner and outer time with distinct effects[6]. Language disengages the sensory coupling that underpins movies, still images, and various kinds of music, diverting the flows of attention towards other dimensions of aesthetics such as meaning and affect; extended attention yet is not duration by its very definition [7]. The stage operates similarly by transferring the facilitation of behaviour coordination from medium to time itself. Scripts deploying verbal text and choreographed actions interact and transform the encounter, hence the quasi-multiplicity of agency that each arts yet each constrains. Such clearly distinct media exhibit core commonalities together with highly complex generative and regulative dynamics. With the filter of these three distinctions, a sizeable body of work remains capable of honouring the epistemic and metaphysical depth of literature and performance arts [3].

Implications for Art Theory, Education, and Public Discourse

The findings of neuroaesthetics suggest several implications for art theory, education, and public discourse. Summarises the key implications in a word-cloud format, providing an overview of key messages and ideas and their relative importance [6]. The broad findings suggest that a healthy pluralism regarding the drives, motivations, and perceived values of ART can inform conceptualisation of education in ART within creative/cognitive domain and beyond[7]. The challenge for education within the cognitive domain specifically lies in identifying the specific contributions of creative/cognitive ART within ART the links, if any, to practically focused forms of ART, and the implications of these links for curriculum design. Neuroaesthetics and its pluralistic framework provide a basis from which to assess aesthetic experience as a suitable subject of public policy discussion [7]. Discussions of policy often engage with the related topic of cultural development and change. Work within neuroaesthetics provides pointers for possible frameworks governing cultural imagination. Policy discussions might also widen to embrace cognition and the broader imagination associated with ART education in particular, formative interactions between ART and CRAFT disciplines [6]. The framing of cognition reflects the

corresponding pluralistic nature of ART and other cultural activities, and relates these activities with a wider cultural milieu. Acknowledging these relationships increases opportunities for engaging with broader policy agendas [7].

CONCLUSION

Neuroaesthetics has expanded contemporary understanding of how human beings perceive, experience, and emotionally respond to art. Through neuroscientific methods and cognitive theories, the field has illuminated important aspects of aesthetic experience, including perception, reward, embodiment, attention, and emotional processing. Studies involving visual art, music, literature, and performance demonstrate that artistic encounters engage complex neural systems associated with pleasure, memory, imagination, and sensory integration. These contributions have strengthened interdisciplinary dialogue between neuroscience and the humanities, offering new ways of understanding creativity, aesthetic judgment, and artistic engagement. Despite these advances, the study demonstrates that neuroscience cannot provide a complete explanation of art or aesthetic experience. Art is deeply embedded within cultural, historical, linguistic, symbolic, and social contexts that exceed the scope of neural measurement alone. Meaning, interpretation, narrative complexity, and subjective experience remain resistant to reduction into purely biological or computational terms. Individual differences, phenomenological dimensions, and contextual influences continue to challenge universal neuroscientific explanations of beauty and artistic value. Furthermore, methodological limitations in neuroimaging and behavioral studies raise important concerns regarding ecological validity, inference, and the oversimplification of artistic encounters. The discussion therefore supports a pluralistic and interdisciplinary approach to aesthetics. Neuroscience should not be viewed as a replacement for philosophy, art theory, anthropology, literary criticism, or cultural history, but rather as one important perspective among many. Integrating neurobiological findings with interpretive and socio-cultural frameworks enables a more comprehensive understanding of the arts and their significance within human life. Ultimately, neuroaesthetics is most valuable when it contributes to broader conversations about perception, embodiment, creativity, imagination, and meaning, while acknowledging the enduring mystery, complexity, and cultural depth of artistic experience.

REFERENCES

1. Consoli G. Brain and aesthetic attitude: How to integrate old and new aesthetics. *Aisthesis*. 2014;7(1):127-41. doi:10.13128/Aisthesis-14608.
2. Tatar T. The possibility of a bridge: Perspectives and limitations of neuroaesthetics. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Philosophia*. 2019;64(2):93-108.
3. Bao Y, von Stosch A, Park M, Pöppel E. Complementarity as generative principle: A thought pattern for aesthetic appreciations and cognitive appraisals in general. *Front Psychol*. 2017;8:1378. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01378.
4. Bromberger B, Sternschein R, Widick P, Smith W, et al. The right hemisphere in esthetic perception. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2011;5:109. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2011.00109.
5. Conway BR, Rehding A. Neuroaesthetics and the trouble with beauty. *PLoS Biol*. 2013;11(3):e1001504. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1001504.
6. Reybrouck M, Brattico E. Neuroplasticity beyond sounds: Neural adaptations following long-term musical aesthetic experiences. *Brain Sci*. 2015;5(1):69-91. doi:10.3390/brainsci5010069.
7. Brattico E, Bogert B, Jacobsen T. Toward a neural chronometry for the aesthetic experience of music. *Front Psychol*. 2013;4:206. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00206.

CITE AS: Kakungulu Samuel J. (2026). Neuroaesthetics: The Scope and Limits of Neuroscience in Explaining Art and Aesthetic Experience. INOSR HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES 12(1): 1-6. https://doi.org/10.59298/INOSRHSS/2026/121.16000