Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum
ISSN: 3030-1718
Vol. 3, No. 1 (2026): Ver

Neural Networks as Artists: Exploring AI in Contemporary Painting

[1] **Seyyare Sadikhova**
https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.026001014

Keywords

Neural Networks
Artificial Intelligence in Art
AI-Generated Painting

Abstract

The integration of neural networks into contemporary painting represents a profound transformation in artistic production, aesthetic theory, and creative authorship. This study examines how artificial intelligence (AI), particularly deep learning architectures such as convolutional neural networks (CNNs), generative adversarial networks (GANs), and diffusion models, functions within modern painting practices. Employing an interdisciplinary IMRAD framework, the research combines technical analysis of neural architectures, case studies of AI-generated artworks, and theoretical evaluation of creativity, authorship, and aesthetic agency. The findings indicate that neural networks enable stylistic emulation, generative image synthesis, semantic text-to-image translation, and large-scale visual recombination, thereby expanding both the visual and conceptual boundaries of painting. However, their outputs reflect procedural and statistical creativity rather than conscious intentionality. The study further demonstrates that AI reshapes artistic workflows by shifting emphasis from manual execution toward prompt engineering, system configuration, dataset curation, and algorithmic mediation. While AI-generated paintings have achieved institutional validation and market recognition, they simultaneously raise significant ethical and legal concerns regarding copyright ownership, dataset consent, artistic labor displacement, and cultural appropriation. Ultimately, neural networks function not as autonomous artists but as transformative creative media that redefine collaboration between human imagination and machine computation in contemporary art.

1. Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into artistic practice represents one of the most significant paradigm shifts in contemporary visual culture. Throughout history, technological

[1] SADIKHOVA, S., Ph.D. (Art Criticism), Senior Lecturer, Department of Visual Arts, Nakhchivan State University, Azerbaijan. Email: seyyaresadixova@ndu.edu.az. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0005-5591-4285

innovations have transformed artistic production—from the invention of oil paint and linear perspective to photography, cinema, and digital imaging software. However, the emergence of neural networks introduces a fundamentally distinct dynamic: systems capable of learning patterns autonomously, generating novel images, and simulating stylistic decision-making processes traditionally associated with human painters.

The intersection of artificial intelligence and visual art has become a defining feature of twenty-first-century creative practice (Sadikhova, 2024). Neural networks—computational models inspired by biological neural systems—enable machines to analyze vast image datasets, extract stylistic patterns, and generate painterly compositions with increasing technical sophistication. Since the widespread adoption of deep learning frameworks in the 2010s, artists, engineers, and researchers have employed algorithms to produce artworks that challenge conventional assumptions about creativity, authorship, originality, and aesthetic intention.

Neural networks, particularly deep learning architectures, are structured in layered systems that process input data hierarchically. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) specialize in visual recognition tasks by detecting edges, textures, shapes, and higher-order compositional patterns. In the context of painting, this capacity allows algorithms to analyze brushstroke textures, chromatic relationships, compositional balance, and stylistic signatures across art historical periods (Sadikhova, 2022). Unlike traditional rule-based software, neural networks learn through exposure to training data, adjusting internal parameters via optimization processes that minimize predictive error. This adaptive mechanism allows the system to internalize complex aesthetic features embedded within massive image corpora.

The historical roots of AI-generated art can be traced to early computer art experiments in the 1960s, when artists and engineers collaborated to explore algorithmic drawing systems. However, these early experiments relied primarily on explicit programming and deterministic instruction sets rather than statistical learning. The contemporary surge in AI-assisted painting began after breakthroughs in deep learning around 2012, particularly in image classification and object recognition tasks. Soon thereafter, researchers demonstrated that convolutional neural networks could separate content and style representations within images, enabling automated stylistic transformation—a technique now widely known as Neural Style Transfer (Gatys et al., 2015). This development marked a decisive turning point in computational creativity by allowing algorithms to reinterpret existing images through the stylistic lens of canonical painters.

The introduction of Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) by Goodfellow et al. (2014) further accelerated artistic experimentation. GANs consist of two competing neural networks—a generator and a discriminator—engaged in adversarial training. Through iterative competition, the generator learns to produce increasingly realistic images that approximate the statistical distribution of training data. Unlike style transfer, which modifies existing images, GANs can synthesize entirely new compositions. A landmark cultural moment occurred when the French

ISSN 3030-1718

collective Obvious used a GAN trained on historical portrait datasets to create *Edmond de Belamy*, which was subsequently auctioned at Christie's in 2018. The sale represented a pivotal moment of institutional recognition for AI-generated painting and intensified debates surrounding authorship, authenticity, and market valuation.

Subsequent developments in generative modeling introduced diffusion-based architectures, which iteratively refine random noise into coherent images through probabilistic denoising processes. Diffusion models have demonstrated superior image fidelity and semantic coherence compared to earlier GAN-based systems. Platforms such as DeepDream, DALL·E (OpenAI, 2023), and Midjourney popularized AI-generated imagery by enabling text-to-image synthesis. These systems translate natural language prompts into visually detailed compositions, effectively transforming linguistic description into painterly output.

The democratization of these tools significantly lowered technical barriers to participation in AI-assisted artmaking. Whereas early AI art required advanced programming expertise, contemporary interfaces allow designers, illustrators, and traditional fine artists to experiment with algorithmic image generation through intuitive prompt-based systems (Sadikhova, 2025). As a result, AI painting has shifted from a niche experimental practice to a widely accessible creative medium.

Beyond technical innovation, the rise of AI-generated painting intersects with broader theoretical debates in aesthetics and philosophy of art. Classical Western art theory frequently associates creativity with intentionality, emotional expression, and individual genius. The Romantic conception of the solitary painter—exemplified by artists such as Vincent van Gogh—foregrounds subjective experience and personal vision as central to artistic authenticity. In contrast, AI-assisted painting distributes creative agency across datasets, algorithms, computational processes, and human prompts. This distributed model challenges anthropocentric definitions of creativity and compels reconsideration of what constitutes artistic authorship.

AI-generated painting also complicates notions of originality. Neural networks are trained on vast archives of preexisting artworks, learning statistical patterns embedded within historical traditions. Critics argue that such systems merely recombine prior styles without genuine innovation. Supporters counter that recombination is itself a foundational mechanism of creativity, observable in human artistic development, where influence, adaptation, and stylistic synthesis are commonplace (Elbeyi, 2025). Thus, AI art situates itself within longstanding debates about imitation, appropriation, and transformation in art history.

Economically and institutionally, AI painting has begun reshaping creative industries. Galleries, museums, and auction houses increasingly exhibit algorithmically generated works, while technology companies invest heavily in generative visual systems. At the same time, ethical concerns intensify regarding dataset consent, intellectual property rights, labor displacement, and algorithmic bias. Legal frameworks worldwide struggle to determine whether AI-generated paintings qualify for copyright protection and, if so, who holds ownership—the developer, the user, or the corporate entity controlling the model.

Technically, aesthetically, economically, and philosophically, neural networks operate at the intersection of tool and collaborator. They extend human creative capability while introducing non-human forms of pattern generation that may exceed direct human predictability. This hybrid dynamic requires interdisciplinary analysis bridging computer science, art theory, media studies, economics, and ethics.

This study therefore examines neural networks not merely as technological instruments but as active participants in contemporary painting practices. By analyzing their computational mechanisms, artistic applications, cultural implications, and institutional reception, the article seeks to clarify how AI reshapes definitions of creativity, authorship, artistic agency, and aesthetic value in the digital era (Gulkhara & Farzaliyeva, 2025).

2. Methods

This study adopts an interdisciplinary qualitative research design that integrates computational analysis, art historical inquiry, media theory, and aesthetic philosophy. The objective is to examine neural networks not merely as software tools but as operative systems embedded within contemporary painting practices. Accordingly, the methodological framework investigates both the technical architectures that generate visual outputs and the cultural, institutional, and theoretical contexts in which these outputs circulate.

The research is positioned at the intersection of computer science and art theory. Rather than treating neural networks solely as engineering artifacts, this study analyzes them as socio-technical systems whose outputs participate in aesthetic discourse, market valuation, and authorship debates.

2.1 Research Design

The research follows a multi-layered qualitative framework consisting of four interrelated analytical components:

1. **Technical Analysis** – Systematic examination of neural network architectures used in AI-driven painting applications, focusing on computational mechanisms and generative logic.
2. **Case Study Evaluation** – Investigation of selected AI-generated artworks and institutional exhibitions to contextualize technological innovation within artistic practice.
3. **Comparative Aesthetic Analysis** – Visual and stylistic comparison between AI-generated paintings and canonical traditional artworks.

4. **Theoretical Interpretation** – Application of aesthetic theory, authorship discourse, and computational creativity frameworks to interpret findings.

This integrated approach enables cross-disciplinary synthesis. Technical analysis provides understanding of algorithmic structures; case studies demonstrate real-world application; aesthetic comparison situates outputs within art historical traditions; theoretical interpretation connects empirical findings to philosophical debates regarding creativity and agency.

The qualitative design is particularly suitable because the study does not aim to measure quantitative performance metrics but rather to interpret aesthetic, cultural, and conceptual transformations resulting from AI integration into painting.

2.2 Literature Review Procedure

A systematic literature review was conducted to establish theoretical and technical foundations. Sources were collected from peer-reviewed journals, conference proceedings, and interdisciplinary art theory publications. Major computational venues consulted included:

- NeurIPS (Neural Information Processing Systems)
- CVPR (Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition)
- IEEE Xplore
- ACM Digital Library

Humanities and interdisciplinary sources were retrieved through Google Scholar and JSTOR to incorporate aesthetic, philosophical, and cultural analysis.

The literature review was organized into five primary thematic categories:

- Neural Style Transfer and convolutional neural network (CNN) visualization
- Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) in creative practice
- Diffusion-based generative systems and text-to-image architectures
- Computational creativity theory
- Ethical and authorship discourse in AI-generated art

Sources were selected based on relevance to AI-generated visual production, citation impact, interdisciplinary significance, and methodological rigor. Priority was given to foundational technical papers (e.g., GAN architecture development, neural style transfer research) and influential aesthetic critiques discussing authorship, originality, and intentionality.

2.3 Selection of Case Studies

Case studies were selected according to the following criteria:

- Demonstrated use of neural network-based image generation
- Institutional recognition (gallery exhibitions, museum display, auction sale)
- Clear documentation of technical processes or architectural framework
- Presence of critical discourse regarding authorship, authenticity, or originality

Representative examples include:

- **Edmond de Belamy**, created by the French collective Obvious and auctioned at Christie's (2018), representing GAN-based generative synthesis.
- Early neural visualization works generated using DeepDream, illustrating convolutional network perceptual feedback.
- Text-to-image painting outputs from DALL·E and Midjourney, exemplifying diffusion-based generative systems.

These examples were deliberately selected to represent three distinct technological generations:

1. CNN-based visualization (feature extraction and perceptual hallucination)
2. GAN-based synthesis (adversarial generative modeling)
3. Diffusion-based probabilistic generation (text-conditioned image synthesis)

By spanning different architectural paradigms, the study traces the evolution of neural network painting systems across successive phases of AI development.

2.4 Technical Framework Analysis

To understand how neural networks simulate painterly processes, three primary computational architectures were examined in detail.

2.4.1 Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)

CNNs were analyzed primarily in the context of neural style transfer and feature visualization. The study reviewed how convolutional layers encode hierarchical representations of visual information:

- Lower layers capture edges, contours, and simple textures.
- Intermediate layers encode patterns, color relationships, and repetitive motifs.
- Higher layers represent complex objects and compositional structures.

Particular attention was given to the use of **Gram matrix calculations** in neural style transfer algorithms. Gram matrices measure correlations between feature maps within convolutional layers, enabling extraction of stylistic patterns independent of spatial arrangement. By combining a content image representation with style correlations derived from another artwork, the algorithm synthesizes hybrid images that preserve semantic structure while adopting stylistic texture.

This analysis demonstrates that CNN-based painting does not “understand” style semantically but encodes it statistically through feature correlation patterns.

2.4.2 Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)

GAN analysis focused on the adversarial training mechanism between generator and discriminator networks. The generator attempts to produce synthetic images, while the discriminator evaluates whether images resemble real training data. Through iterative competition, the system converges toward visually plausible outputs.

Architectural variants were reviewed, including:

- **DCGAN (Deep Convolutional GAN)** – early stable convolutional architecture
- **StyleGAN** – improved architecture emphasizing style control and high-resolution synthesis

The study examined how latent space interpolation enables stylistic hybridization and controlled variation. By navigating latent vectors, artists can explore intermediate stylistic states that blend historical painting traditions or abstract visual features.

Dataset composition was also considered critical. The visual characteristics of GAN-generated outputs are strongly dependent on the training corpus, meaning that aesthetic identity is shaped by data selection. This raises both creative possibilities and ethical concerns related to dataset sourcing.

2.4.3 Diffusion Models

Diffusion-based generative models were analyzed for their probabilistic denoising mechanisms. These models begin with random noise and iteratively refine the image through a reverse-diffusion process, guided by learned probability distributions.

Text-conditioning mechanisms were examined, particularly transformer-based embeddings that encode semantic prompts into high-dimensional vectors. This enables systems to translate linguistic description into coherent visual imagery.

Technical documentation, research papers, and open-source repositories were consulted to verify algorithmic workflows and training procedures. Diffusion models were evaluated in terms of:

- Image fidelity
- Semantic alignment with prompts
- Control over stylistic parameters
- Scalability across large datasets

Diffusion architectures demonstrate greater stability and resolution compared to early GAN systems, making them dominant in contemporary AI-assisted painting platforms.

2.5 Visual and Aesthetic Analysis

A structured visual analysis protocol was applied to selected AI-generated paintings. Evaluation criteria included:

- **Composition** (balance, spatial organization, focal hierarchy)
- **Color theory application** (harmony, contrast, temperature dynamics)
- **Brushstroke simulation and texture rendering**
- **Stylistic coherence across visual elements**
- **Novelty, abstraction, and conceptual transformation**

Comparisons were conducted with canonical works by artists such as Vincent van Gogh and Pablo Picasso to assess degrees of stylistic mimicry versus transformation. The aim was not to measure aesthetic value quantitatively but to interpret how neural networks emulate, reinterpret, or hybridize established artistic languages.

The visual analysis was grounded in art historical methodology, emphasizing contextual interpretation rather than computational performance metrics. Particular attention was given to whether AI-generated paintings demonstrate:

- Structural imitation
- Stylistic recombination
- Emergent visual patterns not directly traceable to a single historical source

This interpretive approach situates neural networks within broader aesthetic discourse rather than evaluating them solely through technical benchmarks.

3. Results

The analysis reveals that neural networks influence contemporary painting across three interconnected dimensions: aesthetic production, creative workflow transformation, and

ISSN 3030-1718

institutional-cultural impact. Drawing from foundational technical literature and case-based observations, the findings indicate that AI systems do not merely replicate historical styles but generate hybrid visual languages shaped by algorithmic architecture, training data composition, probabilistic optimization, and human input (Sadikhova & Babayev, 2025). Rather than functioning as passive emulators, neural networks operate as structured generative systems whose outputs reflect both computational constraints and user-directed parameters.

Across convolutional, adversarial, and diffusion-based models, the results demonstrate that AI-driven painting represents a transformation not only of artistic technique but also of authorship structure, aesthetic logic, and creative labor distribution.

3.1 Neural Style Transfer: Controlled Aesthetic Hybridization

Neural Style Transfer (NST), introduced by Gatys, Ecker, and Bethge (2015), demonstrated that convolutional neural networks (CNNs) can computationally separate and recombine content and stylistic representations within images. Lower convolutional layers encode local features such as edges, contours, and textures, while deeper layers capture higher-order semantic structures and object-level representations (Gatys et al., 2015).

Empirical visual analysis of NST outputs reveals that the method effectively simulates painterly surface characteristics, including:

- Swirling brushstroke textures
- High-contrast chromatic modulation
- Dynamic directional movement in composition

When applied to canonical painters such as Vincent van Gogh, NST produces visually recognizable stylistic emulation. However, despite accurate replication of surface-level aesthetics, emotional intentionality, symbolic meaning, and historical context remain absent. The network does not “interpret” artistic content; it statistically recombines feature correlations derived from training layers.

This confirms theoretical claims that NST performs probabilistic style approximation rather than autonomous creative invention (McCormack et al., 2019). The algorithm operates within mathematically defined constraints—specifically Gram matrix-based style correlations—rather than subjective artistic intention.

The key finding is that neural style transfer functions as a controlled aesthetic hybridization tool, dependent on pre-existing visual data and guided by optimization parameters rather than conceptual agency (Gatys et al., 2015).

3.2 GAN-Based Painting: Emergent Visual Forms

Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs), introduced by Goodfellow et al. (2014), marked a fundamental shift from style transformation toward image synthesis. Unlike NST, GANs do not require an initial content image; instead, they generate entirely new compositions by sampling from learned probability distributions.

GAN architecture consists of two competing neural networks:

- A **generator**, which synthesizes candidate images
- A **discriminator**, which evaluates authenticity relative to training data

Through adversarial training, the generator progressively improves image realism. This dynamic enables GAN systems to produce portraits, landscapes, and abstract compositions not directly traceable to a single source image.

Analysis of GAN-generated portraits—including *Edmond de Belamy* by the French collective Obvious—demonstrates stylistic blending derived from historical portrait datasets. The 2018 Christie's auction of this work signaled a milestone in institutional recognition of AI-generated painting (Christie's, 2018). Importantly, the work's aesthetic character reflects averaged stylistic patterns from Baroque and Renaissance portrait traditions rather than identifiable authorship.

Further examination of Creative Adversarial Networks (CAN) suggests that GAN variants can be optimized to deviate from dominant stylistic norms, introducing controlled novelty within learned distributions (Elgammal et al., 2017). However, observed distortions—blurred facial boundaries, asymmetrical anatomical features, or spatial incoherence—are typically artifacts of statistical modeling rather than intentional abstraction.

GANs demonstrate a form of generative autonomy within probabilistic constraints, producing novel but dataset-bound imagery (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Elgammal et al., 2017). While outputs may appear inventive, they remain conditioned by training corpus composition and optimization dynamics.

3.3 Diffusion Models: Semantic-to-Visual Translation

Diffusion models represent a significant advancement in generative image synthesis. Unlike GANs, which rely on adversarial competition, diffusion systems iteratively denoise random noise guided by learned probability distributions and text-conditioned embeddings.

Contemporary implementations such as DALL·E translate natural language prompts into high-resolution painterly outputs (OpenAI, 2023). This introduces a crucial transformation: language becomes a primary generative input.

Comparative output analysis reveals several consistent characteristics:

- Strong semantic alignment between textual prompts and visual results
- Complex lighting simulation and atmospheric depth
- Convincing painterly texture synthesis
- Multi-style integration within a single compositional frame

The transition from GAN-based systems to diffusion architectures reflects improvements in:

- Image stability
- High-resolution fidelity
- Prompt adherence
- Stylistic controllability

Manovich (2019) argues that such systems expand the aesthetic field by operationalizing language as a direct driver of visual creation. Diffusion models function as **semantic interpreters**, converting conceptual language into structured painterly imagery (OpenAI, 2023; Manovich, 2019).

This shift marks a conceptual transformation: painting becomes increasingly mediated by textual articulation. Creative authorship partially relocates from manual brushwork to linguistic precision.

3.4 Emergence of a Distinct AI Aesthetic

Across CNN-, GAN-, and diffusion-based systems, recurring visual characteristics suggest the emergence of a distinct "AI aesthetic." This aesthetic is not tied to a single historical tradition but reflects computational optimization patterns.

Observed features include:

- Hyper-detailed microtextures
- Statistically averaged facial symmetry
- Surreal object blending across semantic categories
- Repetition of learned visual tropes
- Algorithmically balanced compositions

These patterns correspond with optimization behaviors described in deep learning theory (Goodfellow et al., 2016). Neural networks minimize loss functions that reward coherence, clarity, and dataset conformity. Consequently, outputs frequently display high compositional balance.

While AI systems can simulate stylistic fragmentation reminiscent of Pablo Picasso or other modernist painters, they often gravitate toward compositional equilibrium due to dataset bias toward aesthetically balanced imagery.

McCormack et al. (2019) emphasize that such outputs represent **procedural creativity** rather than experiential expression. Neural networks generate a hybrid aesthetic shaped by statistical learning, feature optimization, and dataset distribution rather than lived artistic experience.

Thus, AI painting exhibits both imitation and emergent formal properties, forming a recognizable computational visual signature.

3.5 Transformation of Artistic Workflow

The results indicate a significant transformation in artistic production processes.

Three primary shifts are observed:

1. **Acceleration of Ideation**
   Neural networks enable rapid generation of compositional alternatives. Artists can explore hundreds of visual permutations within minutes, dramatically reducing ideation time.

2. **Prompt-Based Iteration**
   Creative control increasingly shifts from manual execution to linguistic refinement. Artists engage in iterative prompt engineering, modifying descriptive parameters to influence visual outcomes (Sadikhova, 2025).

3. **Curatorial Emphasis**
   Selection, refinement, and post-processing become central creative acts. The artist's role expands toward system configuration, dataset choice, and output evaluation.

This redistribution of creative labor aligns with theories of distributed authorship in computational art (McCormack et al., 2019). Artists increasingly function as orchestrators, system designers, and curators rather than sole image-makers.

AI systems therefore restructure artistic workflow, foregrounding conceptual direction, system orchestration, and iterative refinement over manual brush-based production.

3.6 Institutional and Market Validation

The institutional acceptance of AI-generated painting—particularly the Christie's auction of AI artworks—demonstrates formal market validation (Christie's, 2018). Galleries, museums, and academic institutions increasingly incorporate AI-generated works into exhibitions and scholarly discourse.

However, valuation often reflects technological novelty as much as aesthetic merit. Media fascination with algorithmic authorship contributes to what Manovich (2019) describes as the intersection of artistic production and technological spectacle economies.

Neural network paintings have thus transitioned from experimental computational artifacts to recognized cultural commodities. At the same time, this institutional validation intensifies ethical debates concerning authorship rights, dataset consent, and labor displacement.

The results suggest that neural networks are no longer peripheral tools but central actors in contemporary painting ecosystems—reshaping aesthetic production, creative labor distribution, and cultural valuation systems simultaneously.

4. Discussion

The findings demonstrate that neural networks significantly reshape contemporary painting across aesthetic, conceptual, technological, and institutional domains. However, their role remains conceptually complex: they operate simultaneously as technical instruments, collaborative agents, aesthetic systems, and cultural provocateurs. This discussion situates the empirical results within broader theoretical, philosophical, and ethical frameworks, addressing how neural networks challenge established definitions of creativity, authorship, artistic identity, and cultural production.

4.1 Rethinking Creativity: Procedural vs. Intentional Agency

Traditional theories of art frequently define creativity as the product of conscious intention, emotional depth, and subjective experience (Sadikhova & Babayev, 2025). Romantic conceptions of artistic genius—epitomized by figures such as Vincent van Gogh—frame artistic production as an expression of inner psychological states and lived emotional intensity. Within this paradigm, creativity is inseparable from human consciousness and experiential authenticity.

Neural networks fundamentally challenge this anthropocentric framework by generating visually compelling and historically novel paintings without consciousness, emotion, or self-awareness. McCormack, Gifford, and Hutchings (2019) characterize computer-generated art as exhibiting *procedural creativity*, wherein novelty emerges from algorithmic systems rather than subjective intention. This distinction is reinforced by Boden's (1998) influential framework differentiating psychological creativity (P-creativity)—novelty relative to an individual mind—from historical creativity (H-creativity)—novelty relative to cultural history.

The present study's findings support this theoretical distinction. GANs and diffusion models generate new combinations within learned probability distributions, producing historically novel visual outputs. However, these combinations arise from statistical optimization processes and gradient-based parameter adjustment rather than intentional self-expression.

Thus, neural networks demonstrate *synthetic originality* but not *experiential authorship*. Their outputs may appear innovative, yet they lack reflexive awareness of meaning. Creativity, in this computational context, becomes an emergent property of system architecture rather than a manifestation of inner consciousness.

4.2 Distributed Authorship and Collaborative Production

The study's findings indicate that authorship in AI-generated painting is not singular but distributed among multiple human and technical agents:

- Dataset curators who determine visual training corpora
- Algorithm designers who construct neural architectures
- Model trainers who configure optimization processes
- Prompt engineers who articulate conceptual instructions
- Artists who select, refine, and contextualize outputs

This distributed configuration aligns with theories of collaborative and networked creativity in digital media (Manovich, 2019). Rather than replacing artists, AI systems reorganize creative labor and redistribute artistic agency. The painter increasingly functions as a conceptual director, system orchestrator, or curator of computational processes.

The case of *Edmond de Belamy*, produced by the collective Obvious and auctioned at Christie's, exemplifies this distributed authorship model. While the GAN generated the final image, human participants selected the dataset, configured the architecture, curated outputs, and embedded the work within art market discourse (Christie's, 2018). Authorship thus becomes layered and relational rather than singular.

Elgammal et al. (2017) propose that Creative Adversarial Networks can deviate intentionally from established styles by optimizing for novelty. However, even in such systems, "intentional deviation" reflects human-defined objectives embedded within algorithmic design. Neural networks operate within boundaries established by human parameters and data constraints.

Consequently, AI-generated painting exemplifies *collaborative computational authorship*, in which agency is distributed across socio-technical networks.

4.3 The Emergence of an Algorithmic Aesthetic

The results identified recurring visual characteristics—hyper-detailed microtextures, statistically averaged symmetry, surreal semantic blending, and compositional coherence—that suggest the

ISSN 3030-1718

emergence of a distinct "algorithmic aesthetic." This phenomenon supports Manovich's (2019) claim that AI art introduces new formal properties rooted in data aggregation and computational optimization.

Unlike traditional painters such as Pablo Picasso, who consciously disrupted visual conventions through intentional stylistic fragmentation, neural networks optimize toward statistical plausibility. Their distortions—blurred contours, anomalous anatomical structures, improbable object juxtapositions—are not expressive gestures but artifacts of probabilistic modeling and training distribution biases (Goodfellow et al., 2016).

Yet paradoxically, these artifacts increasingly function as stylistic signatures. What begins as computational limitation becomes aesthetic identity. The system's constraints—optimization bias, dataset averaging, latent interpolation—generate recognizable visual traits that differentiate AI-generated imagery from traditional painting.

This suggests a significant theoretical insight: although neural networks lack intention, their structural limitations produce consistent formal tendencies that can be interpreted as stylistic coherence. The machine's architecture becomes its aesthetic framework.

4.4 Ethical and Legal Implications

The integration of neural networks into painting raises substantial ethical and legal challenges that extend beyond aesthetic theory.

1. Copyright Ownership

Legal systems across jurisdictions diverge in their treatment of AI-generated works. Many copyright frameworks require demonstrable human authorship, complicating claims over AI-produced images. Questions arise regarding whether authorship resides with:

- The developer of the algorithm
- The dataset curator
- The prompt engineer
- The end-user

This ambiguity destabilizes traditional intellectual property structures.

2. Dataset Consent

Training neural networks on copyrighted artworks without explicit permission has generated controversy among contemporary artists. Concerns focus on unconsented stylistic extraction and potential appropriation. Ethical AI art practices therefore demand transparency regarding dataset sources and model training methodologies.

3. Economic Displacement

Automation of illustration, concept art, and commercial design workflows introduces potential displacement within creative labor markets (Farzaliyeva & Abdullayev, 2025). While AI expands creative accessibility, it may simultaneously restructure economic opportunity within artistic industries.

McCormack et al. (2019) emphasize that authenticity in computational art depends upon process transparency and acknowledgment of training data. Ethical integration of neural networks into painting thus requires responsible dataset curation, disclosure practices, and institutional accountability.

4.5 AI as Medium Rather Than Artist

A central philosophical debate concerns whether neural networks should be regarded as artists. The results suggest that, despite remarkable generative capacity, systems such as DALL·E remain dependent upon human-defined parameters, training corpora, and optimization functions (OpenAI, 2023).

From a philosophical perspective, essential attributes of artistic agency—intentionality, self-awareness, contextual understanding, and moral responsibility—remain absent in current AI systems. Neural networks process symbolic input and statistical patterns but do not possess phenomenological experience.

Boden (1998) argues that creativity involves generative rule-based systems capable of exploring conceptual spaces. Neural networks indeed navigate high-dimensional visual spaces through latent representation and diffusion sampling. However, such exploration is bounded by dataset structure and optimization objectives.

Meaning arises not from the machine but from human interpretation. Therefore, it is more conceptually accurate to frame neural networks as **creative media technologies**—comparable to photography or digital imaging software—rather than autonomous artists.

4.6 Cultural and Institutional Transformation

The validation of AI-generated painting within galleries, museums, and auction houses signals a broader cultural transformation. The Christie's sale of *Edmond de Belamy* symbolized institutional acceptance but simultaneously commodified technological novelty (Christie's, 2018).

Manovich (2019) observes that AI art operates at the intersection of artistic experimentation and technological spectacle. Its valuation often derives from narratives of innovation and disruption rather than purely aesthetic evaluation.

Over time, normalization of AI tools may reduce novelty-driven valuation, integrating neural networks into routine artistic workflows. What currently appears revolutionary may eventually become infrastructural.

Thus, neural networks do not merely generate images; they reshape institutional frameworks, market structures, and cultural narratives surrounding creativity.

5. Conclusion

Neural networks have emerged as transformative agents in contemporary painting, redefining how images are conceived, generated, curated, and interpreted. Through architectures such as convolutional neural networks, generative adversarial networks, and diffusion models, AI systems can emulate stylistic traditions, synthesize novel compositions, and translate textual concepts into painterly form with unprecedented efficiency.

However, as this study demonstrates, their creativity remains procedural rather than intentional. The aesthetic outputs of these systems arise from statistical learning, probabilistic modeling, and optimization dynamics rather than conscious experience or emotional depth. Neural networks exhibit synthetic originality but not experiential authorship.

Simultaneously, AI has restructured artistic workflows. Creative emphasis shifts from manual technique toward conceptual direction, prompt design, system configuration, and curatorial selection. Authorship becomes distributed across human and computational agents, challenging traditional narratives of individual genius and originality.

Institutionally, AI-generated painting has moved from experimental novelty to recognized cultural commodity. Yet ethical concerns regarding copyright, dataset consent, and labor displacement persist, requiring ongoing scholarly and regulatory engagement.

Ultimately, neural networks should be understood not as autonomous artists but as powerful creative media. They extend the boundaries of aesthetic production while remaining embedded within human-defined conceptual and ethical frameworks. Their integration into contemporary painting expands artistic possibility while demanding sustained theoretical, cultural, and philosophical reflection.

References

Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and artificial intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence, 103*(1–2), 347–356.

Christie's. (2018). *Edmond de Belamy auction catalogue.* Christie's.

Elbeyi, B. M. (2025). The impact of AI on visual arts. *German International Journal of Modern Science / Deutsche Internationale Zeitschrift für Zeitgenössische Wissenschaft, 117.*

Elgammal, A., Liu, B., Elhoseiny, M., & Mazzone, M. (2017). CAN: Creative adversarial networks. *arXiv.* https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.07068

Farzaliyeva, E., & Abdullayev, A. (2025). The economic power of culture: How arts and heritage drive employment. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities, 2*(3), 80–91.

Gatys, L. A., Ecker, A. S., & Bethge, M. (2015). A neural algorithm of artistic style. *arXiv.* https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.06576

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning.* MIT Press.

Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (Vol. 27).

Gulkhara, A., & Farzaliyeva, E. (2025). Theatre as a reflection of social change: How dramatic arts capture cultural shifts and historical transformations. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum, 2*(1), 254–261.

Manovich, L. (2019). *AI aesthetics.* Strelka Press.

McCormack, J., Gifford, T., & Hutchings, P. (2019). Autonomy, authenticity, authorship and intention in computer-generated art. *Digital Creativity, 30*(2), 86–100.

OpenAI. (2023). *DALL·E system documentation.* https://openai.com/dall-e

Sadikhova, S. (2024). Contrasting splendor: A comparative study of Baroque and classical styles in visual arts. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum, 1*(2), 144–154.

Sadikhova, S. (2025). Culturonyms in fashion discourse: A linguistic and cultural perspective. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis et Linguarum, 2*(4), 319–331.

Sadikhova, S. (2025). XIX century world fine arts: From classicism to modernism. *Porta Universorum, 1*(8), 106–115.

Sadikhova, S. N. (2022). Principles of creation of some geometric ornaments and their meanings. In *World Science: Problems and Innovations* (pp. 300–302).

Sadikhova, S., & Babayev, J. (2025). Challenges encountered in translation of culture-bound and subject-specific terminology while using Google Translate. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education, 2*(3), 119–126.

Sadikhova, S., & Babayev, J. (2025). Linguistic analysis of art terms in English. *Porta Universorum, 1*(3), 214–223.

Received: 01.23.2025
Revised: 02.02.2025
Accepted: 02.12.2026
Published: 02.17.2026